

# The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1872.

## The Week.

THE Senate investigation into the French arms affair has been ordered, though, by a scandalous piece of trickery, the committee was so elected as to exclude Mr. Schurz or any one sharing his views. The investigation might, we need hardly say, have been assented to without any debate whatever, as it was in the House. Nothing has been gained for the Administration by Messrs. Conkling and Morton's fierce resistance. If there is nothing to be found out, of course nobody will suffer from it but Mephistopheles Schurz and Simpleton Sumner. Whether there is anything to find out or not we do not know, but there is no denying that there is "probable cause" for enquiry, and that the Senate is the proper body to make it. To its charges against Mr. Schurz (still without a particle of proof), the Administration organ this week adds that he is "a man without a shred of conscience in his composition." We hope it will explain to us, before long, how it happens that Schurz is at large. With his character as the *Times* describes it, he must have committed many penitentiary offences in various States.

One result of the length of time the Senate has devoted to discussing whether there should be an investigation into the arms affair or not is that the coffee and tea trade are, and have been for several weeks, completely paralyzed. The House has passed a bill repealing the duty on these articles, but the Senate neglects to act on it. The consequence is that the trade in them has been brought to a complete standstill, nobody knowing what to pay or what to ask for them, and the loss caused is of course very great. We have not had of late a more striking illustration both of the power of effecting sudden changes in the value of property which the tariff puts into the hands of the legislature, and of the recklessness with which this power is used.

We may be permitted to observe that *Harper's Weekly*, which defends the President in a way which ought to be a model to the New York *Times*, confines itself too much either to a general assertion of the goodness of his intentions or to denials of his personal complicity with corruption, and too frequently, for instance, refutes such charges as that about his investment in the Seneca Stone Company. Now we sincerely believe that there are not one hundred men in the country on whom the charges of personal dishonesty, or personal connivance at dishonesty, or "gift-taking," or jobbing investments, have made much if any impression. In fighting these charges, his defenders are fighting shadows. The questions which candid men, who have no prejudices against him and no personal ends to serve either by opposing or supporting him, would like to have answered, are these—and if *Harper's Weekly* will answer them frankly and fairly, it will either do him or the public a great service: Why did he appoint such a man as Sickles minister to Spain? Why did he select new judges to the Supreme Court with special reference to their opinions on a question already *sub judice*, or, in other words, pack the court to procure a judgment on a question of property favorable to his own views of political expediency? Why has he kept and does he still keep a man like Casey in the New Orleans Custom-house, in spite of gross and notorious misconduct, and this man his brother-in-law? Why does he keep a man like Kramer minister to Denmark, in spite of his recent display of incompetency and misconduct, and this man also his brother-in-law? Why did he appoint to the New York and Philadelphia collectorship, when meditating a great measure of civil-service reform, two persons who were notoriously opposed to civil-service reform, and one of whom was, at the time of his appointment, actually engaged in denouncing it in his paper? Why

did he appoint a man like George H. Butler consul-general in Egypt? Supposing him to have been deceived in Butler's character, how is it that a year after Butler's abominations have been exposed he is still retained in office? Supposing the President to have innocently given Leet the letter of introduction to Mr. Grinnell, which we believe he did, how is it that on discovery how Leet had abused it he did not insist on his removal? How is it that, one year after Leet's misconduct had been exposed by a Congressional committee, he still remained in office, and that it took a second investigation and exposure to make his removal even talked of? We might multiply these questions, if necessary, but satisfactory answers to these would break the back of the opposition. It is these things, and not the miserable stories about his investments, and his cigars and horses, which affect the public mind, and they are not met by abuse of Schurz or representations that Charles Sumner is playing the part of a wretched dupe in Schurz's cunning hands.

It is said, and said with a great deal of force, that even if the President's shortcomings in the matter of selecting his subordinates and advisers be admitted, it is more than atoned for by the success of the Administration in the higher fields of statesmanship, such as its foreign and financial policy. We have no desire to belittle what it has accomplished in these fields, but we must remind its champions that Administrative reform, the suppression of corruption and jobbing among office-holders, is the great question of the day, and the one which most nearly affects the highest interests of the nation. We can live and prosper in enmity with England and with the payment of the debt postponed for twenty years, but unless we can reduce the number of thieves and peculators in office, and restore the purity of the courts and respect for the law, something very unpleasant will happen us. People feel this, and for reasons we need not enumerate, just now more than ever before.

General Porter has been examined at Washington before the Senate Investigating Committee on the New York Custom-house abuses as to Leet's connection with the President and himself, but his testimony, as far as it goes, is, as it was last year, favorable to General Grant. He testifies, as he testified before, that the President was unwilling that Leet should go into the Custom-house, and that he, by the President's direction, informed Leet of this fact. He also produced letters of Mr. Grinnell and Mr. Embree acquitting him (General Porter) in the strongest terms of all share in Custom-house contracts or business of any kind, and he explained satisfactorily enough the nature of "the mess," about which such a dark cloud was thrown by some of the New York evidence. He also produced a letter he himself wrote to Murphy when the latter was appointed collector, warning him not to pay any attention to persons seeking offices in the Custom-house and representing themselves as favored or protected by the President or by himself. The *Tribune* says General Porter's slow way of answering and manner generally produced an unpleasant impression on the audience, while the *Times* declares that during the whole of it "the faces of the newspaper slanderers of the President wore a very blank expression."

The news from New Hampshire is of the usual conflicting kind, but we shall refrain from prophecies or calculations. Which-ever side wins, the majority is sure to be small; its effect on the Presidential nomination will probably be very marked, particularly if Connecticut should follow in the same direction, though its value as an indication of the probable result of the Presidential election itself may fairly be doubted. All State victories now will tell in favor of Grant; all defeats will tell against him, though not necessarily against the party under somebody else.

Taking the quotation of Mr. Forney's remarks in the Washington *Chronicle* in 1868, about the one-term principle and General Grant,

from the *Tribune*, we were led into the error into which the *Tribune* fell itself of attributing to him, through a misplacement of quotation marks, a sentence which was that of the *Tribune* correspondent, viz., that "General Grant not only desired to remain President for two terms, but it was only on the assurance of his friends that he should be re-elected that he accepted the office at all." There was no such formal assurance given, it appears, but Mr. Forney's object in reproducing the story of General Grant's objecting to give up his position in the army unless he could have two terms, is doubtless to produce the impression that, unless he is now renominated, he will not be fairly dealt with. But then, what becomes of Mr. Forney's assertion in 1868 that General Grant "was in favor of a one-term amendment to the Constitution, that the party which supported General Grant supported it, and that, above all else, public morality required it"?

There is probably nothing in the history of the South Carolina carpet-baggers more impudent and amusing than the recent hearty endorsement of the Administration, and particularly of its financial policy, in their State Convention. That the rogues should have selected this particular feature for their approval shows that they at least know what is right, though they pursue what is wrong. There is one sorry wag amongst them, too—the President of the Senate we believe he is—who has sent in his hearty adherence to the female-suffrage movement. One of the curious things about the movement is the attractions it has for politicians of doubtful virtue. Whenever you come across a gentleman of the radical school, of somewhat damaged reputation, you may be sure he has got rid of all doubts as to the rightfulness and expediency of giving woman the franchise, and is looking round for a convention or other gathering at which he may announce his conversion. All this class has the same love of the byways of politics that tramps have for lanes and for farm-houses where the men are all away from home. It is touching, too, though a little sad, to see the joyous way in which the women welcome the old tatterdemalions to their platform, put a stitch in their rags, lend them a piece of soap, and listen to their "moral" yarns. Another comical endorsement of the Administration has come from Governor Holden, late of North Carolina, his official connection with that State having been severed by impeachment, and not undeserved impeachment either. He recommends General Grant to the suffrages of a free people. We are much obliged to him. We wonder what Mr. Holden's opinion is as to his own fitness for the governorship of a Territory. But the most amusing thing of all is the delivery in the Senate of a eulogy on the New York Custom-house by Mr. Harlan. We have given already in the *Nation* a sketch of Mr. Harlan's own career, which we are afraid would, even among custom-house inspectors, be considered disreputable.

Mr. Niles G. Parker, State Treasurer for South Carolina, has been much troubled by a statement in the minority report of the Congressional Committee that the sum of \$1,208,577 67 had been paid out by him for which he held no vouchers. In reply to this, he cites the reports of two committees of the South Carolina Legislature, which on two different occasions examined his books and accounts, and the manner of doing business in his office, and reported them all to be in perfect order. The origin of this report, he says, was that, when one of the committees made its investigation, the above sum had been paid out in interest on the public debt, and in remittances to Kempton, the State agent in New York, and the vouchers had not come in in time to be submitted on that occasion, and the committee was consequently obliged to mark the absence of the vouchers in their tabular statement; but on a subsequent occasion they were submitted, and were pronounced in every way satisfactory. This is all very well as far as it goes, but we must remind Mr. Parker and remind the public that a report of a committee of the South Carolina Legislature on Parker's accounts has and is entitled to about the same weight as the report of a committee of the New York Common Council of last year on the accounts of Richard B.

Connolly or William M. Tweed. No other person or committee has ever been satisfied either with Parker's accounts or his way of doing business, and, indeed, there could hardly be a more striking illustration of the demoralization of the government in South Carolina than the serious production, as auditors, of a company of the thieving rascals who compose the Legislature. The majority of the Congressional Committee report that they applied to Parker for an account of the condition of the State finances, but could get no reply from him.

The last revelation of corruption comes from Kansas, and it is very savory. The story begins in 1866, when Mr. S. C. Pomeroy, one of the present senators who figured among the incorruptibles at the Impeachment trial, was endeavoring to secure his election to the Senate, and one Mr. Sydney Clarke was endeavoring to secure his election to the House. So they hired a Lawrence editor, named Reynolds, to support them, or, as they euphemistically called it, "to advance Republicanism in Kansas and to secure a Republican victory." The price they paid the good man was one thousand dollars in cash, and their joint note for two thousand more. Pomeroy paid two hundred and fifty dollars more on account, but when the note fell due the balance was not forthcoming, and the enraged editor took them into court, where they "eutely" and successfully pleaded that the transaction was against public policy. He took them up to the Court of Appeals, but here, weary of war, as the French say, they determined to "settle" with him, and did "settle" with him by getting him a position as Register of the Land Office. This was very well for 1866. In 1871, the "corruptionists" went to work upon a large scale. This time Clarke was a candidate for the Senate, and he had a rival named Caldwell. Caldwell began his canvass by hiring eighty rooms in a hotel at the State capital. He hired another suite of rooms in another building, in which he opened a free lunch and bar, and this latter establishment was popularly known as a "soup house." These little arrangements made, he proceeded to buy up the legislators as if they were mules. To many he gave sums of money; to others promises of offices; to one he promised a post-office then held by a soldier's widow; upon the Kansas Pacific Railroad he attempted to levy thirty thousand dollars as blackmail, or, euphemistically, in consideration of his giving the road his support in the Senate. Of this he got ten thousand, but the company repudiated its promise to pay the rest. He also tried to bribe Clarke to withdraw in his favor, but Clarke refused, and, to do him justice, it must be said that he was himself bribing away like clockwork. This is disgusting, is it not? But perhaps it is a newspaper story. Not at all. It is the unanimous report of a joint committee of both Houses of the Kansas Legislature; and yet Kansas is the most Republican of States.

The Messrs. Naylor, the great iron house, who made a conspicuous figure in testifying against the Custom-house before the Investigating Committee, and especially against the seizures of one of which they were the objects, had proceedings against them suspended some time ago to enable them to procure evidence from England exonerating them from charges of defrauding the Government preferred by Colonel Howe. The evidence has arrived, but the District Attorney declares he is not satisfied with it, though he declines to say why, and has commenced a suit against them for \$200,000. We do not pretend to have any opinion on the merits of the case, but we know that lawyers of the highest standing regard the proceedings as purely vexatious. One thing the public will expect, and that is that the suit will be pushed on promptly, and not allowed to hang over the heads of the defendants till the Philadelphia Convention meets. This observation is, we think, justified by the extraordinary letter written the other day by the Attorney-General to the District Attorney here, and which the latter had the fatuity to publish, instructing him to prosecute the persons who testified before the committee that they had given bribes to Custom-house officers, both gentlemen forgetting several things, and particularly that witnesses before the committee cannot eliminate themselves by their testimony.

The Erie men have, after hard work, achieved something in the nature of a triumph in the New York Legislature, as they have succeeded in persuading the Committee of the Assembly to report against the Attorney-General's bill, which not only repealed the Classification Act, but provided for a new and speedy election of directors. The Committee is willing to repeal the Classification Act, which would afford an immediate relief to the stockholders, but not to do more. This is looked on, and not unnaturally, by the stockholders as next to nothing, inasmuch as they maintain that the present managers are grossly corrupt and are engaged in daily plunder. One very curious feature of the fight has been the unblushing avowal of the petitions, got up by the Ring along the line, that the owners of the road ought not to have it restored to them, because they are foreigners. It gives one a curious glimpse of the condition of the moral perceptions in country districts evangelized by stock-jobbers.

The answer of our Government to Earl Granville's remonstrance has gone out by the last steamer. There are two reports current as to its contents; one is that it declines to modify the Case, but intimates that there is not so much expected as is asked for by way of damages on the American side; the other is that it is a pure and simple refusal to modify. Without having any positive information, we incline to believe that the door has been left open to reply by some species of suggestion, and the impression gains ground that a way out of the difficulty will yet be found—one report says, by means of an agreement on the part of Great Britain to submit everything, under a stipulation that the damages shall in no case exceed a certain fixed amount. Another suggestion is that England should protest against the indirect damages claim, declare beforehand that she will submit to no award upon it, and then go on. This would throw the burden of withdrawing on the United States. The strength of the English position depends somewhat on whether the cotton-bonds claims were submitted to the Commission at Washington under instructions from home, or on the responsibility of the agent. Mr. Gladstone has stated publicly that the Government did not authorize their submission; but other people allege that this is not accurate, or, as the *New York Times* would say, that "Gladstone is a liar." It must be admitted that it is a very pretty quarrel as it stands.

The Gladstone Ministry has had a narrow escape on the Collier affair, having got off from a vote of censure by only twenty-seven majority. Sir Roundell Palmer bore the brunt of the debate, and bore it with great ability, but the work was very hard, and he came near failing. The charge was that Parliament last session authorized the Government to reinforce the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which hears appeals from the Admiralty, ecclesiastical, and colonial courts, by a paid member, who, the act provided, to avoid jobbery, should be a judge of one of the lower courts. The Government wishing to secure Sir Robert Collier, who was not a judge, made him a judge for a few days, and then transferred him to the Privy Council, which the Opposition held was a culpable evasion of the act, and the opposition in the matter has been reinforced by the judges, headed by the Lord Chief-Judge of the Queen's Bench. The controversy has been one of great bitterness, which has been increased by the fact that Mr. Gladstone has always made "conscientiousness" his strong point, and it was therefore delightful to his enemies to assail him on a charge of double-dealing. It has undoubtedly weakened him, and being followed by the Alabama muddle makes the position of the ministry very precarious.

In France the prospect grows daily gloomier. It is now no longer denied that what we have anticipated for some time—the attempt of each faction to enlist the army in its service—has begun. Legitimists, Orleanists, Reds, and Imperialists are all active and hopeful, all regard the actual régime as transitory and intolerable, all despair of mending it by an appeal to the country, and would all like to put an end to it by a *coup d'état*, which they wish to get the army

to perform. The result is that they are all tampering with the officers, and with the most prejudicial effects on the discipline of the troops, but none of them, it is said, has as yet succeeded in securing any general. If it were not that the army is commanded by a man of singular purity of character and single-mindedness, Marshal Mac-Mahon, the mischief done already would probably be greater than it is. The Orleans Princes are, in the meantime, conducting themselves with great discretion. The Due d'Aumale receives men of all parties at his house, and the Prince de Joinville goes back to his old profession as an admiral in the navy, a position which he filled twenty-four years ago with the highest credit. The bill providing a government in case of a *coup d'état*, has passed the Assembly by a large majority. It makes it incumbent on the Councils-General to send two delegates each to whatever town of France the regularly constituted authorities may have fled to from the capital, and these delegates are to form the lawful legislature.

The fight between Church and State over the school question has been opened vigorously in Prussia. There the Government has hitherto, to the great disgust of the liberals, adhered steadfastly to the policy of leaving the schools under clerical control, the majority of the clergy being, of course, Protestant. But the Ultramontanists, having declared war against the Empire, and begun to teach against it in the schools, a bill has been brought into the Landtag, authorizing the Government to supersede the present clerical superintendents of schools by lay ones whenever it thinks proper. The Catholics are furious, and the bishops have signed a unanimous protest against it, while the Protestant clergy of the old orthodox school, represented by Herr Müller, make common cause with them. How the fight will end it is as yet impossible to say.

The Italian question of the hour is the reorganization of the army, but though there is a general agreement that the Prussian system must be more or less closely copied, the Government has apparently not decided to take a firm initiative in the matter. It is, however, the last step towards the unification of the kingdom, the so-called national guard, as we lately showed, being a misnomer, and having no healthy relation to the people it is supposed to protect. However recruited, the soldier is at all events not to be left in ignorance, and there can hardly fail to be a general unanimity in providing for his instruction while in the service. The religious question remains unchanged, amid fresh rumors of the Pope's speedy abandonment of Rome. The new bishops, acting under constraint, still decline to ask for their *exequatur*, but can only be the losers in the controversy. A rather remarkable debate has taken place, under the eyes and with the seeming consent of the Pope, between six Roman priests and as many Protestants, as to whether St. Peter was ever in Rome. The Catholics admitted that the twenty-five years which tradition assigned to the first pontificate were too many, and that for no more than ten could the Apostle have been in Rome; for the rest, they simply denied that their opponents succeeded in proving him never to have been there. The disputants had their stenographers on hand, and spoke to a limited audience invited by ticket.

Some curious information has come to light about the antecedents of Shere Allee, the man who killed Lord Mayo. He is a mountaineer from the Himalayas, and was a soldier—and an excellent one—in the British cavalry; sober, faithful, obedient, and orderly; but, being engaged in a "blood feud" with members of his own tribe, he used to get a furlough about every half year for the purpose of killing one of his relatives on the other side of the frontier; having performed this duty, he always returned promptly to his regiment. As ill-luck would have it, however, he met one of his relatives on British soil, in the neighborhood of Peshawur, and killed him, too; but on British soil the act was a crime, so he was sentenced to death, and afterwards to transportation for life. The punishment was incomprehensible to him, and cut short what he considered a blameless career. So he avenged himself on the Governor-General, who represented the Government which had injured him.

## THE PROPER TIME TO AGITATE FOR REFORM.

In view of the discussion now raging, and which has been raging for some time past, over the various "investigations" which have been proposed, the question—which, though not new, is very interesting—presents itself: What is the proper time and place to agitate for the removal of abuses and the improvement of the administrative machinery of the Government? It has arisen frequently already in a slightly different form, in relation to the duty of voters with regard to what they believe to be abuses of their power on the part of caucuses and nominating conventions. Some persons have held, and an increasing number actually hold, that the time for an elector to speak out his mind on this point is after the nominations have been made, and while the candidates are already in the field, and the public attention fixed on them. But the political managers have always maintained that to do so then was to imperil the election, and, through this, to injure the party; and that it was, therefore, the duty of those who thought the success of the party essential to the best interests of the country to keep silent till the election was over, and to vote the regular ticket; but, the minute its success was assured, to make such remonstrances as the case seemed to call for, and in this way prevent the recurrence of the thing complained of. To this, on the other hand, the reformers have replied, that if they waited till the election was over, their remonstrances would fall on leaden ears; that the managers, who live from day to day, and have the deepest confidence in the forgetfulness of the public and the changefulness of the political sky, would be little troubled by threats which, at worst, could not be put into execution for a year or two; and that the people, who can ill afford the time they have to give to political affairs during the canvass, and are little disposed to listen to general preaching on the subject of political purity which has no application to pending events, and are totally opposed to crying over spilt milk, would pay but small heed to denunciations which, however admirable in the abstract, could produce no immediate practical effect. Indeed, so well recognized is the futility of post-election preaching on the propriety of "nominating none but good men for office," that there would be no difficulty in getting all the corrupt politicians in the country to engage in it heartily if it were made worth their while; and that all men who have seriously considered the various plans for keeping bad men out of office are very generally agreed that "scratching," or, in extreme cases, "bolting," is the only one of any real efficacy.

Now the question comes up—and it must be admitted that it is a very serious question—what is a Republican to do who is not satisfied with the Administration: who either has lost his confidence in the President, or who believes that, though personally pure himself, he is surrounded by and is influenced by men of whom the same thing cannot be said, and that, if he is re-elected, their influence will be strengthened rather than diminished? That there is a large body of Republicans of this kind who are firmly rooted in their dissatisfaction, and who believe that it rests on sufficient evidence, there is no denying. What are they to do?

All are agreed that they ought not to go over to the Democrats. Nobody in the Republican ranks looks for anything good in politics from Democratic hands, or doubts that a Democratic Administration would introduce fearful confusion by reopening questions which should never be reopened, and trying experiments which should never be tried. Therefore, all concur that reform, if to be sought at all, should, if possible, be sought "inside the party lines," as the phrase goes. All the discontented people in the nation are indeed cordially invited by the party papers and orators to come into the party, as the only place in which great problems can be solved or great grievances redressed. So far, therefore, the path is clear: it is the duty of a reforming Republican to seek his reform by agitation within the party.

The next question is, by what methods are reforms to be sought within the party? To this the fathers of the church give absolutely no answer. We do not know a single party chief or newspaper to whom we can refer an anxious layman for light on this most im-

portant subject. We can tell him, however, what he must not do. He must not band himself together with others of his way of thinking, and draw up platforms differing from the regular party platforms, and nominate candidates other than the regular party nominees, because this is what the Missouri Liberals have done or propose to do, and we are assured by all the party organs that this is a base and foolish thing to do, because, apart altogether from its hostility to General Grant, it threatens, by creating a split in the party ranks, to bring the Democrats into power, than which there could be no greater calamity. Nor must he write or speak in a critical or condemnatory manner of the Administration, for two reasons. One, and of course the principal one, is that his criticisms, if unfavorable, are sure not to be well founded. The things with which he is dissatisfied—say the management of the New York or New Orleans Custom-house, for instance—are not things with which a reasonable man ought to be dissatisfied. A great many other men as good as he are not dissatisfied with them; besides which, the President, if he gets time, will make the changes called for; that he has not made them already does not tell against this view, because he found the system which he administers existing as it is now when he came into office. The other is that the Administration represents the party. The party put it in power, supports it, and is responsible for it before the country. You cannot, therefore, attack the Administration without attacking and helping to divide and weaken the party, and if you divide and weaken the party you endanger the delivery of the country to the Democrats. You remember what happened in Missouri: the bolt there sent the author of the Brodhead letter to the Senate. Do you wish to see this repeated on a great scale in the national politics?

The President is the most important officer of the Government; the choice of the President is the most important political duty the people have to perform. As long as Presidents are eligible for re-election, no proper estimate of the fitness of the actual incumbent for re-election can be formed without a careful consideration of the manner in which he has already performed the duties of the office, and the proper time to form this estimate is, of course, the last year of his term. To form it any sooner would be unjust to him; to form it any later would be useless, except for historical purposes. Nevertheless, if you attempt to form it in the last year by either investigation or discussion which seems likely to lead to an unfavorable conclusion, you are accused of foul play. If you attempt to lay before the public the shortcomings of his administration, you are accused of seeking to prevent his renomination, as if this were a sufficient reason why you should not be listened to, whereas this object of yours furnishes almost your sole excuse for saying anything at all. You are told that to try to demonstrate the President's unfitness for the position is to attack the Administration; to attack the Administration is to attack the party; to attack the party is to prepare the way for its defeat; to defeat it is to throw the country into the hands of the Democrats, and so on in a vicious circle. How, then, under the circumstances, are reforms to be effected within the party lines? If we may not, in the fourth year of his term, discuss the qualifications of a President for re-election, when should they be discussed? If they may not be discussed at all, and the mere fact that a man does not believe that a President should be re-elected is sufficient to deprive him of all claim to a hearing when he attempts to give a reason for his belief, is not this virtually converting the term of four years into eight years?

It is said that the debate which has been going on in the Senate and in the press over the Custom-house investigation and the French arms investigation is really the work of the Philadelphia Convention, and that the malcontents should wait till that body meets, lay their plaints before it, and abide by its decision. But the fact is that the Philadelphia Convention, as everybody knows, will, like all conventions, be guided in its action by opinions already formed by its constituents. Delegates are already being chosen in every direction, and, by the use of the usual machinery, pledged to vote for General Grant's nomination—that is, pledged to support him no matter what may be said at the convention. To argue with them

would be as useless as to argue with the master of thirty legions. In fact, the main business of the politicians who support the Administration is now, and has been for several months, so to arrange matters that the question of renominating the President shall not, at the convention, be an open question. Those, therefore, who doubt the expediency of renominating him can only reach the convention by creating, if they can before it meets, such an opinion adverse to him as shall render him in its eyes not available.

Whether they can succeed in doing this, or whether it would be well if they could succeed, are matters on which we now express no opinion. We merely wish to point out the unreasonableness of the outcry which is raised against all discussion of the claims of possible candidates, and particularly the claims of the President, in advance of the meeting of the convention. Attempts to show that he is not a good man for the place, or that some one else would be, are not the base and contemptible work that some people would have us believe. "President-making" is by no means out of place during the next three months. On the contrary, it is about the most important business in which an American politician can engage. Saying that a man who arraigns the Administration for misconduct or incompetency ought not to be listened to, because he seeks to prevent General Grant's renomination, is very like saying that you ought not to listen to a man's arguments because he aims at persuasion, or to listen to testimony because its object is proof. "Why, you're trying to corner me," said the gentleman who found his antagonist getting the better of him in a discussion; and so also some of our office-holders, when you accuse them of malfeasance, declare that, as your aim is to get them out of office, nobody ought to mind anything you say.

#### THE CRISIS IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THE rumor that the Pope is preparing to quit Rome is probably true, but whether he will quit it or not will doubtless depend on the state of his health. All attempts to arrange a *modus vivendi* between himself and the Italian monarchy have thus far failed, and may be expected to fail, because even if he were not notoriously obstinate he could not, without a loss of dignity too great to be borne, descend from the position he has always occupied towards what he calls the "Subalpine Government," Victor Emanuel being still, in his estimation, King of Piedmont simply. The material changes which are taking place, too, in Rome are so extensive as to make the city intolerable to its late rulers. Old houses are being swept away, new streets opened, new squares made, great excavations in the old ruins commenced, and, indeed, the old capital begins to wear the air of a bustling, active, growing modern city. Every step in this process of renovation is either an insult or a reproach directed against the Papacy. If all these changes be indeed reform, the sacerdotal administration of bygone days must have been abominable; if they are not reforms, they are too painful to be countenanced, or even witnessed, without protest by the Pope, particularly as it is not the city only which is undergoing transformation, but the whole system of administration—the law, the police, the finances, the taxation, the schools. When we say that Father Hyacinthe is at this moment in Rome writing letters denunciatory of the doctrine of infallibility, we say all that is needed to show the extent of the moral and political, as well as of the material, revolution through which the city is passing.

The Pope has made it a point of honor to shut himself up in the Vatican and represent himself as restrained of his liberty; but the Italian Government has respected his whim; and, while allowing nobody to enter the precincts of that palace without his permission, of course places no obstacles whatever to his egress. But then this voluntary confinement, now that it has lasted so long that everybody has got used to it, runs the risk of becoming ridiculous if protracted; and it must be attended with more or less inconvenience in the transaction of business. It is, therefore, hardly to be wondered at that the Pope talks of packing up and retiring to Trent, a quiet old town of the Tyrolese Alps, in which the old faith still burns with the

old glow, and in which he would at least be the principal personage of the place; and this resolution is doubtless strengthened by the gradual extinction of all hopes of interference in his behalf on the part of the Catholic powers. Indeed, it cannot now be said that there are any Catholic powers, in the sense in which the Pope understands that term. Austria has plainly gone over to the enemy; Spain is in the hands either of a republican faction which hates the church or of a monarchical faction led by Victor Emanuel's son; while the expectations which were doubtless excited by M. Thiers's accession to the Presidency of the French Republic have been destroyed by the spectacle of the internal difficulties of France.

The greatest difficulties of the Papacy, however, are, and promise to be, religious rather than political, and, so far from dying out, seem to increase, and bid fair at present to lead to an extensive if not formidable revolt against Papal authority. The movement which Döllinger heads in Germany, and which, after Father Hyacinthe's failure, seemed likely to die out in France, has been revived in that country by an open declaration of war against the Papacy and its adherents on the part of the Abbé Michaud, a man of considerable attainments and influence, who has been officiating at the Madeleine ever since the execution of the late curé by the Commune. He declares, but without proof, that Archbishop Darboy instructed him before his death that outward obedience to official authority was all that was required of a faithful soldier of the church, and that it was not necessary that any priest should in his heart accept the dogma of infallibility. This view the present archbishop declines to accept, and the abbé has accordingly seceded, not from the Catholic Church, but from the Papal ranks; and he proposes to preach and administer the sacraments as heretofore, and has hired a room for that purpose, and is receiving, it is said, a considerable number of adhesions, both from priests and laymen. Similar audacity is displayed by the German leaders, and with more or less success. In Belgium, too, the Papacy has experienced a serious defeat, arising out of what is known as the Langrand scandal. M. Langrand, who is a speculator on a great scale, conceived the idea of getting up a financial company to use Belgian capital, which is cheap, in buying up and working Hungarian lands, which are also cheap, but might be made to yield large profits. In order to raise the capital, he and his associates actually secured the aid of the Pope, to whom it was represented that one of the objects of the company was to "Christianize capital"—that is, concentrate it in the hands of pious families devoted to the Church. His Holiness was charmed with this idea, and, when M. Langrand combined a loan for the Papal Treasury with his Hungarian company, the Pope gave him a letter of commendation which set all the bishops and priests in Belgium working for his benefit, and the peasantry poured their savings into his coffers with extraordinary rapidity. The Pope was more delighted than ever, and made him a Count, and his head was completely turned. His operations became larger and larger, but the crash, of course, came at last. The company failed; the assets proved worthless, and a carrier-pigeon brought out of Paris, during the siege, the result of a judicial examination of Langrand's papers, which he had left there, and which showed him to be a swindler of the first order. The excitement in Belgium was so great after this that the appointment of a M. Decker, who had been concerned with Langrand, to be governor of a province, led, lately, to riotous demonstrations, and almost to a revolution. The general result has been a great increase of anti-clerical feeling among the middle-classes, and a corresponding increase of exertion on the part of the clergy to retain their hold on the peasantry, and this is only possible through either the prevention of popular education or the retention of popular education in their own hands.

In this matter of popular education the church and the state are in fact on the point of joining battle, and have joined battle all over Europe. In Ireland, in Austria, in Prussia, in France, and in Italy, both sides are preparing for and engaged in a struggle which must have a serious influence on the future of the Papacy, because, if worsted in it, it is driven out of its last stronghold. It has lost the

middle-classes and the town artisans in every country ; if it loses the peasantry, it will have lost everything.

The Papal authorities are so well aware of this that they are not so seriously troubled by anything else. The Old Catholic movement, interesting as it is in some aspects, has not so great dangers for the Pope, for the simple reason that it is not likely to make any headway among the main body of the Pope's followers. Such a movement must find its recruits mainly among the middle or educated classes ; and it is no longer possible to build up a new church or renovate an old one with their aid, for they are profoundly sceptical both in France, Germany, and Italy. To the peasants as they now are, and to the women, Michaud and Hyacinthe and Döllinger are and will remain simply insubordinate and renegade priests. Those who expect to see the Old Catholic movement take the shape of a new Reformation forget how completely the times and the men have changed since Luther revolted. Thousands will go with it in scouting the doctrine that the poor old Pope is not liable to error, and there is little doubt that the main body will go further, but not along ecclesiastical ways. They are not prepared to get up any enthusiasm for the early councils, or to take Dr. Döllinger's account, or the Abbé Michaud's, of the exact point at which the church became Ultramontane. In fact, they will probably be found readier for the easy course of doing without a church than for anything else. One of the curious signs of the times, and one which good Catholics must have pondered deeply, occurred in Paris the other day. A bishop was consecrated in the church of St. Sulpice, and the Minister of Public Worship was present officially to represent the state in the person of M. Jules Simon, an avowed materialist, to whom the whole ceremony was, of course, a farce. The laity were there in great force too, but they occupied themselves with hooting and jeering at the solemnities, and, indeed, displayed so little reverence for them that the new bishop came near being mobbed. The departure of the Pope from Rome at such a crisis as this one can hardly help considering not less full of significance for the church than the sack of the city by Alaric was for the old empire.

#### "ORGANS."

THE New York *Times* asks us, with a good deal of heat, to prove the charge that it is a "hired organ" of the Administration, or else acknowledge that we uttered a slander when we made it. Our answer is perfectly simple : we have never made it. When the *Times* puts the term "hired organ" in quotation marks, it is evidently under the impression that the term is ours. This impression is, however, a delusion. We have never applied it to the *Times*, and, what is more, have never thought it applicable. If anybody concerned will have the goodness to point out any passage in which it occurs in our columns in reference to the *Times*, we shall not only declare that it got in there through inadvertence, but make an apology. We have no proof of anything of the kind. We have never heard of any. We shall not, therefore, accept the invitation to call at the office of the *Times* to satisfy ourselves of the purity of its motives, because we do not suspect it.

The origin of this unfortunate hallucination on the part of the *Times* is doubtless to be found in the fact that we last week called the attention of the President to a pretty little collection of abusive epithets which we made in its columns from articles attacking Senator Schurz, and we hinted that he would do well to put a stop to this style of defence. We made this appeal to him, however, not in the belief that the *Times* was "hired" by him, but that it was his "organ," anxious to serve him, and not inattentive to his feelings, wishes, and opinions as to the best mode of serving him. We do not understand the term "organ" to be necessarily an offensive one—certainly not morally offensive. That we think it is, or ought to be, a term of professional reproach, we do not deny. But then, a great many respectable newspapers, conducted by respectable men, are and have always been "organs"—that is, papers devoted to the defence of the opinions, policy, or reputation or interest of particular persons or bodies, and in the habit of receiving from such persons or bodies information, suggestions, or instigation towards the composition of editorial articles. We do not ourselves think this a desirable position for a newspaper to hold. We think it involves inevitably a certain amount of falsity in its relation to its readers;

we think the extent to which this relation has been imposed on a great many newspapers by what is called "personal journalism" is one of the curses of the press. But then, a great many excellent men think differently, and it would ill become us to call them knaves on that account. We shall simply do our best, by fair means, towards making their view of the matter odious, and inducing the next generation of editors at least to repudiate it.

Moreover, there are good and bad ways of discharging the functions of an organ, and we hold that the *Times*'s way is a very bad one. Indeed, not to mince matters, we think its mode of advocating General Grant's claims to re-election has been a disgrace to journalism, and, further, we believe this to be the general opinion of intelligent and respectable men. For although it is permissible in any paper to defend a public man with any reasonable amount of warmth against what it believes to be unjust attacks on him, it is not permissible to writers who respect themselves, and who wish to be respected, to blackguard his enemies for him. That is the work of a bravo, and a journalist ought not to do it. We may perhaps forgive a man, out of consideration of the weakness of human nature, for running after a person in the street who has injured him, and in his passion and resentment calling him foul names, and throwing out foul insinuations against him; but we have no such indulgence for a bystander, and, above all, for a professional teacher, who runs along with him and in cold blood engages in the same dirty bout of billingsgate. If it be proper or excusable, therefore, in anybody on General Grant's behalf to call Senator Schurz an "unscrupulous adventurer," "an office-jobber," "a dog," "an unprincipled man," "an arrant humbug," and to suggest "that his leg be tied to his chair when gentlemen are speaking," it ought to be General Grant himself who does it. It ought not to be possible for him to get any leading metropolitan paper to engage in such work.

The reason why we appealed to General Grant to put a stop to it was that it was not simply disreputable and ridiculous, but injurious to him in so far as it produced any effect at all on anybody. We may safely ask the most experienced political veteran on the point whether any candidate was ever seriously injured by being called names, or was ever helped by having his opponents called names. And we have no hesitation in appealing to the judgment of the whole country whether anything can be more injudicious than to meet charges of corruption or demands for investigation by abusive language towards the persons who make them. Do not Hall, Tweed, Connolly, and all that company know this to their cost ? Does not everybody's common sense tell him that the best answer, if not the only answer, to charges of this kind, and the surest way of overwhelming the accuser, is to push on the investigation, and prove if you can that he is a light-headed slanderer ? There is a moment when, perhaps, a little vituperation is allowable, and that is when the investigation is closed, and it has been proved that there was nothing to be found out. Has that moment come in Senator Schurz's case ? Was there really no cause for the Custom-house investigation ? Has it revealed nothing and led to nothing ? Must the man who proposed it have been really an unscrupulous slanderer ? And do we yet know that the investigation into the French arms scandal is the suggestion of pure malice ?

And now one word as to Senator Schurz personally. The *Times* has for two months assailed him with the grossest abuse and insult. It has called him, day by day, an "unscrupulous demagogue," "a heartless demagogue," "an unscrupulous adventurer," "an office-jobber," "a political charlatan," "a dog," has declared him "wholly un-American in spirit," and "a born destructionist," "an arrant humbug," and a "dishonest, malicious, and unprincipled man." It describes him, in short, very much as one would describe a "confidence operator," or as it described Bill Tweed and Slippery Dick itself last summer. This sort of talk is, of course, taken by itself, tolerably silly ; but it might be made damaging if supported by proofs. Has the *Times* produced any proof in support of it ? Not a particle. Has it any proof to produce ? We think we are warranted in saying that it has not, since it produced its "exposure" of Schurz a month ago. This "exposure" was made during the debate on the Custom-house investigation, and was threatened so long in advance that it looked as if it were hoped that the mere threat would shake Schurz's nerves. It came at last, however, and we read it, and reread it, after having rubbed our eyes, with great care, and we can honestly say that we do not remember to have often read anything in political literature more ludicrous. It purported to be a sketch of Mr. Schurz's career, but the facts it produced were those not only of an honorable but of a brilliant career, and it would have been painful, if it had not been comical, to witness the way in which the writer tried to make it appear discreditable by sticking in epithets and innuendoes and inferences of his own all over the recital. By taking a pencil and striking these out, there remained a record which any man in the country might be proud of, and which any man might be glad to see his son strive for. The performance of the *Times* was indeed

so absurd that serious reply to it was unnecessary; we contented ourselves with banter. Mr. Schurz answered it in his place in the Senate, showing the absolute falsehood of some of the charges made by the *Times*, and the misrepresentation contained in some of the others. This answer *Harper's Weekly*, which is certainly as good a friend of the President's as the *Times*, pronounced a complete vindication so far as vindication was called for, but of not one of its corrections did the *Times* take any notice. Such service not only discredits those who render it, but discredits General Grant himself as long as he sits silent under it.

For ourselves, we may be permitted to say that we sincerely admire Mr. Schurz's public career. We believe him to be an honest man; we know he is an able, and eloquent, and useful one. We consider him to be an honor to the country in which he was born, and a still greater honor to the country which he has adopted. We believe that the devotion to great principles which first showed itself under less fortunate circumstances in the Old World, and has stood the test of twenty years of loyal service in the New one, will not fail him now on the more conspicuous stage to which he has been raised; and we are sure that we can say that what is best in the intelligence of the country, if it does not always approve of his judgment, and does not share his distrust of the President personally, at least goes with him heartily in his assaults on a régime in which the Leets, Murphys, and Forneys are honored and rewarded, and which the Camerons, and Mortons, and Conklings direct and control.

#### THE FRENCH STAGE.

PARIS, February 16, 1872.

IT must be said, to the credit of French society, that it has never been so sad as it is now. Among my own acquaintance, which is very large, I have not heard of a single ball given this winter. Here and there, some few very young girls have a *sauterie*; there are a few balls given in the American colony, which has become as brilliant as it ever was; but, in French society, dinners are the only entertainment permitted in the present mood of Paris. I hear that even in colleges and in schools the tone of the boys has become much more serious. We have been spared this year the usual promenade of the *bauf gras* on the boulevards, with his ridiculous cortège of druids, of knights, of gods and of goddesses; very few masks were seen on the *mardi-gras*, and the masked balls of the Opera have been entirely given up to the lowest rabble. With all their elasticity, the Frenchmen feel their defeat much more keenly than the Austrians did theirs after Sadowa. It must be said, also, that the uncertainty of the future is added to the sufferings of the past; all minds are preoccupied with the dangers of our so-called Republic without republicans, with the Internationale, which still is groping in the dark, with the Bonapartist conspiracies, with the financial difficulties of the situation.

The theatres have profited by the sullenness of society; for it is still permitted to spend an evening at the play, and the theatre affords a distraction which takes the mind out of its own troubles for a few hours. I am not of those who find fault with the French nation for its love of the theatre. There is, after all, something very unselfish in the interest our minds can take in a drama, in an opera, or in a vaudeville. Society gives no rest to our evil passions, though it forces us to assume virtues which often we do not have. The theatre actually changes us from actors to witnesses, and if what we see is not absolutely bad, one can always derive some profit from it. To condemn the theatre seems to me no wiser than to condemn the reading of novels. Anything that obliges a man or a woman to think of something different from themselves tends to make them better. Under the Empire, unfortunately, the theatre had become as corrupt as the rest, and I do not remember a single successful comedy or drama where adultery was not the necessary ingredient of interest. Even now, we feel this bad influence. "Christiane" is the best piece lately produced at the Théâtre Français; it is by M. Gondinet, who is the most moral of our dramatists. He made his reputation by very clever and witty vaudevilles—"Gayot," "Minard & Cie.," "Les Grandes Demoiselles," etc.; but his ambition was always to be tried at the Français. "Christiane" is a success; it is admirably played, full of good sentiments, and it has decidedly virtuous intentions; but its whole interest lies in the struggle of Christiane's legal father with her real natural father. Christiane is pure, her mother was not; and the innocent girl makes us still think of adultery. Her situation is very painful between her nominal father and the man who knows that he is her father. The law has the best of it; and the *illegal* father is obliged to leave France in some diplomatic capacity. But of this painful and almost immoral *donnée* M. Gondinet has made a really virtuous drama.

I am sorry to say that there is not even a longing for morality to be found in the two last pieces of M. Alexandre Dumas fils. This singular

writer has adopted the habit of publishing all his pieces with a long and pretentious preface. He speaks like the moralist of the age, the new Solomon; what we want, he thinks, is the exact description of our vices; he believes that our immorality comes from our bad laws, especially from the law which forbids divorce. There is a strange admixture of good and evil in his disposition, in utter want of knowledge of the world. He was born a bastard, and there is a certain hatred of society perceptible in all his words, which comes evidently from the fact that in his childhood he felt a little like an outcast. First an outcast by necessity, he has now made himself an outcast by pride. He likes to represent the *grands de la terre*, as Bossuet called them—princes, noblemen, noble ladies—as utterly vile, mean, despicable as a human creature can be represented. In his last piece, "La Princesse Georges," the Princess and the Prince are equally vile in different ways; they are moral monsters, only of a different species. He is a villain, and she is a coward; he is a traitor, and she loves him, though he is a traitor. I do not speak of the "Visite de Noces," which is only a piece in one act. The subject is so painful that it is better not to analyze it. But I am obliged to confess that these two pieces are played night after night; to be sure, the audience is very cold, almost frigid; people are drawn to the Gymnase, where Alexandre Dumas' pieces are played, by curiosity more than by pleasure. And Paris is such a large city that a feeling of curiosity, mixed with interest for the talent of the author, can fill it for many a night before the success can be attributed to any real sympathy with the sentiments of the drama. It is time, however, that some critic should ridicule the moralistic pretensions of M. Dumas. He wrote, not long ago, a letter to M. Thiers in pamphlet form, in which he spoke of the regeneration of France: we must be saved by the truth, by justice, by faith in ideas, and so on. I need not enter into the analysis of this pamphlet, where fine words covered few thoughts; but it is certainly curious that, after such a sermon, Dumas should return quietly to his old habits, and he is certainly to be admired if he thinks that "Princesse Georges" is a *regenerating* work.

The political piece, "Rabagas," has however put even "Princesse Georges" in the shade. Sardou, the author of it, began life in the Rue St. Jacques, in the Quartier Latin, as a poor *maitre d'études*; he lived almost in abject misery and married his washerwoman; but he emerged by degrees from his obscurity by a number of gay, bold, and clever pieces. He has a great ability for theatrical intrigue (take as an example "Les Pattes de Mouche"); he minglesthe comic and the dramatic in good proportions, and can paint with a coarse brush the absurdities of the day (for example, "La Famille Benoîton"). He is now rich; he has bought a château at Marly, which he has filled with fine books and works of art. His wife died a few years ago; the Empire made Sardou a knight, then an officer of the Legion of Honor, which did not hinder him from entering among the first the palace of the Tuilleries, abandoned by the Empress. He is a man without any fixed ideas; all he cares for is success; he wrote "Séraphine" against the clericals at the end of the Empire, and everybody understood that the name of Séraphine covered that of the Empress Eugénie, who was a well-known partisan of the Papacy.

The fashion now in Paris is against the men of the 4th September; consequently, Sardou has promptly made a new piece against them, under the name of "Rabagas." This personage is a type composed half of Emile Ollivier and half of Gambetta: he is the lawyer, the politician *par excellence*, who flatters the passions of the multitude, but only wants to get into power and to find himself in the gilded drawing-rooms of royalty—in what the English call the cold shade of aristocracy. The scene is in Monaco; and the present Duke of Valentinois, the Prince of Monaco, is actually brought on the stage in a truly Aristophanic manner. I hear that the Duke wrote a letter to Sardou, which is much to his credit, in which he simply objects to his being called familiarly Florestan on the stage. Otherwise he finds no fault with "Rabagas." The demagogues of Monaco are plotting in a coffee-house called the Flying Toad, and are making up the programme of a revolution. A young American lady, who is in the good graces of the Duke, and sees the court in a state of great consternation, contrives to see Rabagas and brings him over to the Duke by an invitation to a ball. Rabagas is quite ready to be converted, as he speaks to his fellow-conspirators of "those immortal principles of '89 for which you are all ready to give *my* life, and I to give *your* life." Rabagas goes to court in tights, and by the influence of the American tempter is named minister. The insurrection, however, breaks out, and Rabagas gives the order to shoot and imprison his old associates. Then comes a change in the fortunes of Rabagas: the Duke does not want him any more, the populace hiss him, and he is kicked out of power. He leaves the stage with these contemptuous words: "Adieu: I go to the only country where men of my stamp are understood—to France!" You may imagine the mixed feelings of a French audience before such an exhibition; the Bonapartists have taken the theatre of the Vaudeville for their head-

quarters, and they cheer for ten minutes such phrases as this: "Quand une société est pourrie, l'avocat s'y met." One of the socialist associates of Rabagas, when he is drawing up his programme, tells him: "But you forget the social question." "Bah!" says he, "don't let's be silly; there are no social questions, there are only social positions." There is a comical account of the insurrection of Monaco, where one government is formed in a red room, another in a green room, another in a yellow room; and the green, red, and yellow governments successively proscribe each other. This transparent allusion to the scenes in the Hôtel de Ville on the 4th September, the 31st October, and the 18th March, was cheered with fury. So far, those who hiss are in the minority, and the sergents-de-ville, whose comrades were killed under the Commune, and whose wives were fleeing for their lives at that period, show an energy in the repression of hisses which is not very surprising.

The piece draws a crowd every night. I saw it on the first representation, and though I could not help being much amused by its cynical wit, I left the theatre sadder than I entered it; for I perceived in the play an absolute want of moral sense, an absence of that spirit which can distinguish what is noble and what is ignoble in the spirit of reform. Every liberal in it appears as a charlatan; the representative of royalty, the Duke, is himself a poor dissolute old man, who keeps a mistress in his own palace, and makes her the companion of his daughter, who receives secretly in her apartment one of the officers of the guards. There is not one character to represent virtue and morality. At the same time, the feelings of the audience are either favorable to Rabagas, contemptible as he may be, or else they show a rabid conservatism which reminded me of the days of the 2d December. The rich middle-class of Paris is longing for a saviour—for a man of iron, who will sweep the streets with gunpowder and shot, silence all the Rabagas for years to come, and send not only the Communists but the Republicans to Cayenne. This is now the dominant feeling; the horrors of the Commune explain it partly, but Paris is also very angry at being decapitalized, outlawed, put in suspicion by France. It has no patience with the Jules Simons, the Gambettas, the Jules Ferrys, the Favres, the lawyers, who have allowed it to commit so many follies since the 4th September; it is ashamed of itself and of the men it has recognized as leaders. It is waiting, as for a Messiah, for a man of action.

## Correspondence.

### REPORT OF THE FORTIETH PARALLEL GEOLOGICAL SURVEY. TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Owing to the condition of the Union Pacific Railroad, the *Nation* of February 1 has but just reached me. In that number you comment on the Congressional discussion concerning the report of the Fortieth Parallel Survey. In your remarks you underrate, in my opinion, the "popularity" of the work. You say that "the nature of such a work precludes it from being of immediate use or interest to any but a *very limited* class of persons, and its proper destination is at once the public libraries of the country and the archives of foreign governments and scientific bodies."

Like all comparative phrases, the words "very limited" cannot be rigidly defined. There appears, however, to be a popular misunderstanding at the East as to the number of people eager for such information as the book in question contains. On the Pacific coast, mining is the main industry, and the number of persons engaged in this pursuit, although perhaps "very limited" in comparison with the total population of the United States, is very large when compared with the population of this not unimportant part of the country.

Now, a very large proportion of the mining community is anxious for information of the kind referred to. Long before the publication of the report, the War Department had received applications for copies largely in excess of the number to be printed—nearly double the number, if my memory does not fail me. After its publication these increased largely in amount. I (if I may be allowed to present personal experience) being then on the editorial staff of a mining journal of some considerable circulation, received a large number of enquiries from individuals desirous of obtaining the work, so large a number, indeed, that our paper advocated a Congressional publication to meet the demand. This certainly would indicate that the report has also other "proper destination" than that given by you.

We feel out here that our national legislature has not paid due attention to an industry which has built up States, and produced upwards of a thousand million dollars, in a little more than twenty years. We feel aggrieved, for instance, that to make way for printed matter of no public interest, the reports of the Commissioner of Mining Statistics should be unreasonably de-

layed year after year, and that the Commissioner should receive an appropriation entirely inadequate to the demands of his department. And when we see a disposition on the part of Congress to diminish the small favors grudgingly allowed, we grumble about it, and write to the papers.

A. D. H., Jr.

RENO, Nev., Feb. 23.

[Our remarks had reference to the publication as a whole, and were more strictly appropriate, say to the volume on Botany, than to that on Mining. Of course we attribute the widest value to the work of the Expedition.—ED. NATION.]

## THE MORMON PROBLEM.

### TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: While writing for another purpose, let me express the hope that the *Nation*, among its other good works in calling attention to injustice and sham and corruption, may have something more to say in reference to the state of things in Utah.

On my way to this coast from the East, just about the time the U. S. officials were inaugurating their present policy, I made a little visit among the Mormons at Salt Lake, and, like every other visitor not entirely blinded with prejudice, could but have many of my previous notions reversed and my sympathies in no small degree stirred up. It seemed to me then, from what I heard and saw—an impression which has been deepened by all which has since occurred—that the Federal officers were animated by a bitter spirit of persecution against them, combined, perhaps, with the vulgar desire of making a sensation, utterly inconsistent with justice and the dignity of a great nation, and that the course being taken was wholly unwarranted by anything in the existing state and tendency of Mormon affairs.

Utah within the past few years has been developing with wonderful rapidity in all the elements of a fully civilized and enlightened community, with the single exception of its system of polygamy. The women are allowed as much freedom to go and come as they are in New York; are given, too, the ballot; paid generally the same wages as men; and occupy in not a few cases as independent a position. The two sexes are schooled together in all the branches of a liberal education, with books and by teachers that are selected for merit, and, in some cases at least, independent of any considerations of Mormonism. Any sect of the religious world is perfectly free to go in and establish churches and Sunday-schools there of its own. The Mormons themselves invite public discussion, giving up to it their own tabernacle, and are far more catholic in their fellowship practically than nine-tenths of the Christian church. The arts and sciences are cultivated and encouraged among them to an extent equalled only by a very few of the older States, Orson Pratt, while I was there, delivering a course of lectures on astronomy, which went more thoroughly into the subject than speakers generally would venture to in our Eastern cities, attended night after night by crowded houses; and not a few of the problems which other communities have taken up only in theory, that of connecting religion and amusement for instance, have been solved by them practically, and with the completest success. In short, all those agencies of education, religion, and free discussion usually proclaimed to be so mighty and infallible against error, have free play among them, with an open door for more to go in; and, if Gentile Christianity and civilization cannot meet what remains of their polygamy and superstition in a fair fight, and without resort to persecution, and vanquish them, it certainly looks as if the Mormons had something on their side we need to get—not destroy.

There are influences that, a year ago, were doing the work, doing it silently, surely, nobly. Polygamy was bound, sooner or later, to be sloughed off in an easy and natural way by simply the toning up of the moral health. Federal interference is about as much in place as the knife of a surgeon would be to a patient getting well of fever. The generous, liberty-loving heart of the country needs only to know what is doing there on the part of its officials to be filled with indignation, and stop at once a persecution worthy only of the dark ages.

I write this entirely as an outsider, and from a love not of Mormonism, but of fair play. Shall I say, too, that the Christian church, with all its holy horror of polygamy, is bound to share some of the blame for it with the Mormons? It is not an abnormal and seedless growth, but a legitimate fruit, so far as doctrine is concerned, of that literalness of Scripture interpretation which all the religious world has done so much to encourage. The same principles which the rest of us have carried out in our ways they have carried out in theirs, leading perhaps to grosser results, but not connected the less with the parent stock.

Will it do, also, to hint that possibly Mormonism may have its divine mission to work out as well as all other religious bodies, not, indeed, through its polygamy and superstition, but through its inner faith? There can be no question that it does really have this faith, a belief in directness of relationship with Deity and divine things that is in marked and grateful contrast with the materialism and indifference that we find so much of through the Great West—a faith more like that of the old Puritans than is felt by any other Christian sect. All history shows, New England history certainly, that these old root faiths, with their visions and revelations and realness of the spirit world, though terribly gnarled and ugly themselves, are wonderful things into which to graft new truth. At any rate, it will do no harm to look on the hopeful side, and to remember that the world's good before now has come out of its Nazareths.

K.

OLYMPIA, W. T., Feb. 1, 1872.

## TO TAKE A DARE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I noticed in your review of Mr. Eggleston's "Hoosier Schoolmaster" a statement that in New England you had never heard the expression, "I don't take no such a dare." Some thirty-five or forty years ago, when I was a school-boy in a country district in the southern part of New Hampshire, we used to play a game in which we used the expression, "Give us a dare," and "I'll take a dare," etc. And from the game we borrowed and used an expression very similar to the one quoted by you, and with the same meaning. The subject is not of the highest importance, but it is a principle with you, I believe, "to give even the devil his due." New England should have, in this matter, all that properly belongs to her.

Truly yours,

D. PUTNAM.

YPELANTI, MICH., Feb. 19, 1872.

[This is a case of a word's being kept current longer on this side of the water than in England. Before our fathers came across, they, in common with Shakespeare, Chapman, Johnson, and their contemporaries, had the expression in use; but if it was used in New England only twenty-five years ago, it survived longer here than it did in its home. It may, to be sure, still be locally and colloquially current in England. In literature it is obsolete in both countries.—ED. NATION.]

## Notes.

A. DENHAM & CO. will publish, March 15, the first collected edition of the "Minor Poems of Homer," including the Battle of the Frogs and Mice, hymns, and epigrams, in the translations of Parnell, Chapman, Shelley, Congreve, etc., with an introduction and a life of Homer.—The *Bookbuyer* for Feb. 15 announces the following firm changes: Charles Scribner & Co. becomes Scribner, Armstrong & Co., and Scribner, Welford & Co. becomes Scribner, Welford & Armstrong, the late Mr. Scribner being succeeded by his son, Mr. J. Blair Scribner. Scribner, Armstrong & Co. announce an edition of George Macdonald's poems, beginning with "Within and Without," his longest effort. Arabia will form the subject of the third volume of Mr. Bayard Taylor's Library of Travel and Adventure.—An English version of the "Eneid," by C. P. Cranch, will be published in the fall by Messrs. J. R. Osgood & Co., in a uniform style with Bryant's "Homer" and Longfellow's "Dante."—Collectors of Americana will be glad to hear that Ellis & Green, London, have just acquired copies of the letter of Columbus announcing the discovery of America (No. 4 of Harrisse), first edition, in a perfect state, and a copy of the still rarer letter of Americus Vespuccius on the same subject, supposed to be the second edition (No. 23, Harrisse), of which only one other is known; and a copy of No. 30, Harrisse, the only other known copy of which is in the Mercantile Library at Hamburg.—A translation of "Joseph Noirel's Revenge," by Victor Cherbuliez, is to be begun at once in the *Week*.

—Mr. Alexander Agassiz sends us two specimens of the first application of carbon printing to "general illustrations of natural history." One is a figure, natural size, of *Echinocidaris punctulata*, printed by Mr. Bierstadt according to the Albert process; the other, a slightly reduced section of *Laganum decagonalis*, printed by the American Photo-relief Printing Company, of Philadelphia, by the Woodbury process. The former has the decided advantage of dispensing with mounting altogether, and in a bound volume this consideration is an important one; in other respects, it would be difficult to choose. Mr. Agassiz calls attention to the good promise that these processes hold out of substituting, in scientific memoirs, the absolute

accuracy of photography for lithography with no sacrifice of mechanical convenience and with great gain in point of fulness of illustration and detail. It is not only for scientific memoirs, let us remark, that this future may be expected, and we trust that the public will soon require, wherever it is reasonable that they should, the fidelity of the sun-picture in place of the fancy of the draughtsman. For this purpose it is not necessary to wait till the new processes reach their highest artistic development.

—We had been hoping that good sense and broad views would prevail in Congress, and secure the passage of the appropriation to indemnify the College of William and Mary, which, during the campaign on the Peninsula, was held and afterwards burnt without cause by Federal troops. A year and a half ago we sketched the checkered career of this venerable institution of learning, so filled with reverses, and yet so marked by a vitality that neither fire nor war could overcome. The opposition to an obvious act of justice on the part of the Government is headed (*ex officio*, we trust) by General Garfield, and, so far as we have observed, rests on two objections: first, that a costly precedent would be established; and second, that the college was a nursery of disloyalty. As regards precedents, we have only to say that if any similar case is presented, the same restitution should promptly be made. It is a fact that the college was suspended on account of the rebellion; that ninety per cent. of its students entered the Confederate service; and that the Confederates used the building as a barrack and a hospital till Williamsburg was evacuated. Its destruction, however, was not a necessary act of hostilities, and the question remains whether the college has not a moral claim for damages, and, what is the gist of the whole matter, whether the State would be better off to-day without the college—in fact, without all its colleges. If it would be, the appropriation asked for should be denied; if it would not, no better pretext could be had for fostering liberal education in Virginia without making invidious distinctions, and without incurring a general obligation to endow every other Southern college.

—It is the general principle which is chiefly commendable in the act of Congress setting aside the Yellowstone region as a national park. It will help confirm the national possession of the Yo Semite, and may in time lead us to rescue Niagara from its present degrading surroundings. That the park will not very soon be accessible to the public needs no demonstration. The expedition under Captain Barlow, sent out by General Sheridan last summer, judged it probable that a railroad could be built up the Wind River Valley to the Upper Yellowstone, and so northward to the Northern Pacific Railroad, which would then be connected with the Union Pacific. Meantime, it may be well to improve the opportunity of learning a little more of the geography of the Northwest, and to that end two maps, just published by the Department of the Interior, will be found serviceable. One embraces the whole reservation; the other, on a larger scale, takes in only the Yellowstone Lake and vicinity for a distance of about five miles from its borders—as far, on the south, as the head-waters of the Snake River. Soundings are given over the greater part of the lake, which is nowhere more than fifty fathoms deep. The chief features of this remarkable basin have already been appropriately named by Prof. F. V. Hayden and his associates, or by earlier explorers, but there is still room, we observe, for a "national" nomenclature if that is insisted on rather than a natural one. Congress, we may say here, would do well to suppress the names of "Wyoming" and "Washington," which threaten to become fixed whenever these Territories are admitted as States. Both names are irrevocably associated with older parts of the country, and of right should be cherished for them. They are, moreover, the only instances in which our Territories have failed to receive beautiful and distinctive appellations.

—It has often been said of the New England farmers as a class that a large majority of them had long been unprosperous till luckily the war came, and enabled them to pay off debts and mortgages in a depreciated currency, and even for a time to make a fair annual interest on their invested money and labor. Before that time, it is alleged, only the garden farms which had easy access to a market, and the milk farms near to the cities, were in a condition of reasonable prosperity, while as for most of the agricultural population, in spite of the dignity of the honest farmer as insisted upon by the essayists, and the superiority of rural life to the whirl of urban existence, the farmers' boys were all emigrating to the towns and to the West, and the farmers' daughters, superfluous, were accumulating in the stagnant country villages. A recent address before a Massachusetts agricultural society, delivered by Mr. George E. Waring, Jr., seems to countenance this popular impression, and endeavors to show how the interests of the New England farmer may be so promoted as that he may be able not only "to pay his bills at the end of the year and start again at the point at which he started twelve months before, but how, as the world moves, he may move with it, how he may be in all respects as much better off at the end of each year as the mer-

chant or professional man is." Many a farmer is to-day eager to know how this may be done, Mr. Waring thinks, and is anxious that his children at least may be got out of "the good old way" in whose ruts he himself has so long been travelling. To begin with, the Massachusetts farmer, says Mr. Waring, "must work with all his mind and all his strength, and he must work for the love of money and as only the love of money can make him work." He must no longer listen to the orators at the county fairs, who remind him that "it is upon the brawny shoulders of the sturdy yeomanry that the great fabric of our civilization rests." Mr. Waring, who "lives behind the scenes, and knows the farmer class as he knows his own brother," asserts that such oratory is "threadbare palaver, and thinks that whenever a farmer is stingy, close-fisted, narrow-minded, and pig-headed, jealous and suspicious of all improvement," he is not at all "a gentleman by right of his profession," but, on the contrary, deserves contempt, and can only secure himself from it by ceasing to do his work in a mean way and doing it respectably and thoroughly; and as this he can only do by hard work and the expenditure of money, he must, as above stated, work with all his mind and all his strength and as one who loves money and intends to have it.

—It is work done in pursuit of personal wealth, Mr. Waring asserts, to which alone we can look for that further improvement in the condition of New England farming which will make it "as attractive to the better class of young farmers as New England cotton-spinning is to young manufacturers." The hackneyed command, "Keep the boys on the farm," must somehow be obeyed. How, it is the subject of Mr. Waring's address to show. In the first place, then, the elderly agriculturist must point the younger to instances in which energetic men, by intelligently working their farms, are securing not only the means of luxurious living, but an income equal to the annual four, or five, or six thousand dollars of the professional man. Or, better still, send the boy away for a year or two to the best farmer in the region, telling him that when he comes home with his mind made up in sober earnest to be a good farmer, he shall want no help that the parental bank-stock and the parental encouragement can supply. And to this end it would be well, Mr. Waring says, if there were less of parental jealousy of the son's movements, less of parental restraint, and more of companionship and good-fellowship. And while the elderly farmers are doing thus much to keep their sons in the ranks, something must be done to make the ranks worthy of the new recruits. To talk of "plain living and hard work" is nonsense, because what the new generation wants is to live comfortably and to add to comfort as much of refinement and luxury as may be had. Each farmer, looking carefully to his own peculiar circumstances, must manage his farm with a determination to get as much out of it as the best knowledge he can command joined to his best energy will enable him to get, and he must begin by admitting that "there is a better way of farming than any he has yet tried," and that, if he is to have his son as his helper and successor, it behoves him to bestir himself and find this better way. Mr. Waring's counsel seems to come nearest to being practical when he remarks that in nearly every town there is one man whose eyes are open to the value of improved methods, and of the application to farming of science and liberality; that in every county there are many such men, and in every State a multitude of them, and that these should join to encourage each other and instruct their neighbors in "high farming." He is older and tougher, he says, than once he was, and now grows fat on opposition and contempt, but he cannot help feeling that "the utter and entire failure of every agricultural operation" in which he is interested "would carry joy to the hearts" of all his neighbors—who yet are not such bad neighbors either, as old-fashioned neighbors go when a man attempts "new-fangled farming" amongst them, and who, though they last year decried and hated the methods which this year they have adopted, are not less firm this year in deerring and hating the methods which they will next year adopt. The agricultural conservative, too, has all the conservative's wide notion of what constitutes a permissible weapon of controversy, and sensitive "high farmers" in some localities where they may set up their rest, are not likely to be very enviable men. However, the future bids fair to be better for them than the past has been, and such schools as that at Amherst and the new Bussey Institute at West Roxbury cannot fail to prove great allies of the men with the phosphates as against those who farm with hard cider instead, and get their milk from half-frozen and half-starved cows.

—At a time when American criticism, even of the better sort, was too apt to consist of platitudes expressed in a very academic sort of English, Mr. Jones Very, a tutor in Harvard College, published a few papers which, at any time in our history, would have been pronounced good criticism, as showing thought, knowledge, and taste. Looking recently at his essay on Shakespeare, a little while after looking at Mr. George Macdonald's "Phantastes,"

a work justly to be admired and justly to be condemned, we came upon an interesting example of an independent use by Mr. Very and Mr. Macdonald of the same striking image, or of two images nearly the same. This, perhaps, is hardly worth noting, especially in the case of a writer so abounding and superabounding in fanciful imagery as Mr. Macdonald, whose mind is, as it were, saturated and made flabby by its own uncristallized poetry; but we are glad of an occasion to call attention again to Mr. Very as a man (and poet) too much forgotten. The image of which we speak is, in Mr. Macdonald's book, that the hero is attended by a black shadow, or "double," uncaused by the sun, representing an affectation of his ideal—that is to say, an attempt to appear not what he is, but at appearing to be what he aspires to become. This double once withstands the hero in visible shape, as a larger self, and must be conquered before a certain right but humble act can be done. As affectation, it is represented as disguising people's faces, and making them look ugly to each other. Thus Mr. Macdonald, following a train of thought which results in what we suppose must be regarded as sufficiently enervating and "unhealthy" reading. Mr. Very, in speaking of Wordsworth and Milton as compared or contrasted with Shakespeare, says that in the two former "we see the struggle of the child to become the perfect man. . . . They are striving for that silence in their own bosoms that shall make the voice that created all things heard. It is the self which opposes this that they see within them and feel without them; and it is this alone, under whatsoever forms it may be, that they describe. Like the fallen angel, they cannot escape the consciousness of themselves, and the brightness of poesy, instead of blazing directly down upon their heads, causes them, from the obliqueness of its rays, to be ever accompanied by their own shadow." It is, however, always well to remind ourselves that Mr. Very's "this alone," which poets such as Milton and Wordsworth could describe, is not the small matter that one might take it to be if one listened only to the mystics and the idolaters of the objective. Milton's rebellious will, Dante's intensity of spirit, Wordsworth's inaccessible egotism—these also are parts of the universe, and are at the bottom of no small amount of poetry of varieties not elsewhere to be found in right perfection.

—The Franco-Prussian war made absolutely no contribution to the science of naval warfare, and the efforts of Prussia to establish the principle of immunity for unarmed vessels engaged in legitimate traffic were also fruitless. Nevertheless, it may be said that the foundations were laid for substantial improvement of international law. One of the most important phases of this process may now be studied in a pamphlet relating to the North-German ships in Asiatic waters ("Die norddeutschen Kriegsschiffe in Ostasien"), presumably written by an officer of one of the two corvettes, the *Hertha* and *Medusa*, there stationed at the outbreak of the war—the latter at Yokohama, the former at Che-foo, in company with a French squadron. We need not speak of the uncertainty which long prevailed on the part both of the German and the French commanders as to the actual declaration of hostilities, and, when this was confirmed beyond doubt, as to the proper attitude of the belligerents' ships on that distant coast. Official tidings which now could be sent in an hour were then so long in coming that the *Hertha*, by invitation of the captain of the French ship *Dupleix*, joined in the salutes of Napoleon's day (August 15). The same commander proposed, in case the war rumors proved true, to arrange with the representatives of their respective countries for the neutralization of the Chinese and Japanese waters, subject to Government approval. This, considering the French naval preponderance, and the fact that France had in Saigon a station for equipment, repairs, and rendezvous, such as Germany did not possess in the East, was highly honorable to the source from which it emanated. The idea was favorably received by the representatives in question, and on the 22d of August an urgent request for neutralization was despatched to their Governments. By the time it reached France the men of the 4th of September were in power, and Jules Favre declared that so long as Prussia used every resource by land to crush his unhappy country, he could not consent to relinquish any advantages by sea. Meantime, too, the Governor of Saigon had manifested his intention to disregard the diplomatic understanding, and the result was that both the German vessels were shut up in Yokohama during the remainder of the war, and that German merchant vessels were compelled to lie up for the same period. Prussia's official assent reached Yokohama, via Singapore, November 22, 1870; the French refusal arrived two months later, January 22, 1871. The doctrine, however, that the security of the European colonies in Eastern Asia demanded abeyance of those differences which, at home, could only be settled by violence, was so manifestly just that it might well be taken up, now that the world is at peace, and made the subject of international treaty.

—Our readers will probably remember the pretty little poem in the first book of the "Golden Treasury," beginning :

"While that the sun with his beams hot  
Scorched the fruits in vale and mountain,  
Philon the shepherd, late forgot,  
Sitting beside a crystal fountain,  
In shadow of a green oak tree,  
Upon his pipe this song played he:  
Adieu love, adieu love, untrue love,  
Untrue love, untrue love, adieu love;  
Your mind is light, soon lost for new love."

The song is anonymous, and is referred by Mr. Palgrave to the early years of Elizabeth. In "La Fleur des chansons amoureuses," however, which appeared at Rouen, it is supposed in the year 1600, and which was reprinted at Brussels in 1866, on page 202 we find a song which is either the original or the translation of the one mentioned above. To show their similarity, one need only compare this first stanza with what we have quoted above:

"Tandis que le soleil ardent  
Grilloit les herbes en la plaine,  
Le berger Philon cependant,  
Assis auprès d'une fontaine,  
A l'ombre de trois chênes vers,  
Sur son flageolet sonnoit ces vers :  
Bergère légère, bergère légère, bergère."

Equally close in their resemblance are the other verses, which we copy, since the reprint is rare, as well as those, the fourth and fifth, that do not appear in the English version:

"Lorsque j'estois auprès de vous,  
J'estois votre cœur et votre âme,  
Vous soupiriez à tous les coups,  
Vous brûlez d'une chaude flâme ;  
Trois jours durèrent nos amours,  
Et se finirent en trois jours.  
Bergère légère, etc."

"Vous veîtes un nouveau berger,  
Dont soudain vous fûtes espisez,  
Soudain vous voulustes changer,  
Soudain il eut ma place prise,  
Et soudain il en vint un tiers  
Que vous aimastez volontiers.  
Bergère légère, etc."

"Je croys que vous faites discours  
D'avoir une âme si féconde  
A faire des nouveaux amours,  
Que vous en peuplez le monde ;  
Mais vous discourez bien en vain  
Puisqu'ils périssent si soudain.  
Bergère légère, etc."

"Tels amours faibles et rétifs  
Ne viennent jamais en croissance,  
Car comme petits avortifs,  
Ils meurent en prenant naissance,  
Et telle plante ne produit  
Jamais ny la fleur ny le fruit.  
Bergère légère, etc."

"Si m'avez vous fait grand plaisir  
De me quitter à si bonne heure,  
Avant que j'eusse le loisir  
De vous aymez d'une amour seure,  
Car mon amour s'est terminé  
Deux jours avant que d'estre né.  
Bergère légère, bergère légère, bergère."

In the same volume one finds the originals of some of the shorter and looser poems of Suckling, of Dryden's plays, etc., which, on the whole, are the least valuable parts of our literature.

#### EARLE'S PHILOLOGY OF THE ENGLISH TONGUE.\*

THE object of this work is to furnish a popular account of the English language, its rise and formation, its spelling and pronunciation, the kinds of words (verbs, nouns, pronouns, adverbs, etc.) which make up its substance, and the general characters of its syntax and prosody. All these subjects are treated in a loose, desultory manner. The author gives such observations as have an interest for his own mind or seem likely to interest his readers, with little thought of method or completeness. He writes with an evident affection for his theme; and his book, whatever its weaknesses and faults, cannot be reproached as a dull one. In his style we sometimes find a pomp of rhetoric which goes to the very limit of good taste; as when he says (p. 209), "In this gradation of symbolism we see what provision is made for the lighter touches of expression, the vague tints, the vanishing points. Towards a deep and distant background the full-fraught picture of copious language carries our eye, while the foreground is almost palpable in its reality." Sometimes, however, he sinks into a bald and almost slovenly way of writing. Thus, on p. 11, "In the seventh century Anglo-Saxon was cultivated by means of Christianity, and over five centuries were produced those writings which have partly survived. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the spread of Christianity northwards had the effect of getting the Norsk Sagas to be committed to writing." And again (p. 23), "So the reign of

\* The Philology of the English Tongue. By John Earle, M.A., Rector of Swanswick, formerly Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, and sometime Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford." Oxford: At the Clarendon Press. 1871. Small 8vo, pp. viii, 599.

Alfred is apt to get paralleled with those rude tribes among whom our missionaries introduce a translated literature at the same time with the arts of reading and writing."

Oftener still, we meet with singularities or quaintnesses of expression such as *sound-shunting* (p. 3) for Grimm's *Lautverschiebung* (or progression of mutes); *Latin documentary period* (p. 46) for the period when Latin was used in public documents; *rocalic crowding* (p. 118) for the change of *i* into *y* consonant, as in *opinion*; "to trend on the subject of accent" (p. 137) for *to trench*; or "prefixed assimilatively" (p. 145), in *woak, woots*, for *oak, oats*; a word employed *nounally* (p. 182); *flat adverb* (p. 361) for one which has no added ending to distinguish it from the adjective; *flat syntax* (p. 461) for that which is determined solely by the order of the words; "great acquisitions in the compass and in the go of language" (p. 496); "and with this *modulatory progress* there is certainly a *collocatory progress* afoot" (p. 536), where the first progress is an increased demand for good reading, and the second an increased freedom in the arrangement of English sentences.

If these oddities of expression were the worst features of the book, we should have little to complain of. Unfortunately, the book itself, as a whole, must be called weak. It shows throughout a want of logical precision, a lack of clear, sharp thinking, and a consequent lack of sound judgment. Owing to this defect, the author—though his scholarship, at least in Anglo-Saxon, seems to be respectable—has fallen into many superficialities and even errors. Of these we give here some of the most striking which we have noted in a cursory perusal of the work.

We are told (p. 8) that "of all the Gothic family of languages, it is the Scandinavian group alone that has made any approach to a *form* for the passive." Would our author make a Gothic family with the Gothic itself left out of it? Or is he not aware that the old Indo-European middle-passive form is preserved in the Gothic, with signs indeed of decay, but still in constant use?—thus Goth. *bairada* (is borne), corresponding to Gr. *φέρει* Sansk. *bharata*.

When he says (p. 13) that "the Sanskrit grammar is the product of a long sustained and cloistered culture; the Gothic grammar was the property of shepherds, who were little in advance of the life of nomads," he is evidently confounding two very different things—one, the grammatical system as inherent in the language itself, and recognized unconsciously by the great body of those who speak it; the other, that system as drawn out by studies research, and embodied more or less adequately in scientific form, in a series of rules or propositions.

He speaks (p. 15) as though it were questionable whether the English is more nearly related to the Norse dialects or to the Low German; and recites an incident (probably apocryphal) which "tends to show that in A.D. 912 Englisc was very like Danish." It is said that the Northman Rolf or Rollo, when he did homage to Karl the Simple for his new fief of Normandy, refused to kiss the emperor's foot unless he lifted it to his mouth; and that his language, heard in this refusal, was taken by Frankish bystanders for Englisc. As if such a mistake, in those who understood neither Norse nor Englisc, was proof of any near likeness between them. And as if facts (?) like these could have any weight against our own knowledge; for what Englisc was in 912 we know from its monuments, and of what the Norse must have been at that time we at least know enough to be certain that it was very different from Englisc.

Among English words of ancient British (*i.e.*, Welsh) origin, Mr. E. has no hesitation in placing the old verb *ear* (to plough). He asserts (p. 19) that "soon after the Saxon settlement, the verb *ERIAN* must have been adopted from the British vernacular." His only question is whether the word belonged to the primitive language of the British Celts, or was only the Latin *aro* borrowed by them from their Roman conquerors. It does not occur to him that the common word may have come alike to Latins, Germans, Celts, from their common ancestors. But be this as it may, it is absurd to suppose that a word which belonged to all the old Teutonic idioms (Goth. *erjan*, Old High Germ. *aran*, *erran*, Old Frisic *era*, Old Norse *erja*) was adopted by the Saxons from the British vernacular.

He regards *be* (p. 40) as "a mere vague prefix in the modern *because, besides*"; though the sense of *by*, local in one, instrumental in the other, is perfectly evident. "The preposition *BE*," he says (p. 38), "at the time when we first become acquainted with it, means *about, around*." What this time is, we are left to conjecture: that the prep. *be* in Anglo-Saxon ever meant *around*, he does not and (we think) could not show. The English compound *besiege* does not mean to *sit around* (as explained on p. 82), but to *sit BY, at, over against*, with hostile purpose: compare the Latin *obsidio, Greek ἑθέλpa*, both of which signify a *besieging*.

If we compare pp. 46 and 53, we find that the writer of the "Ornulum"—who "has not the Anglian mark of *s* for *sh*; who writes *shall* and not *sall*"

—cannot be placed in Norfolk or Lincolnshire, but may have written in Peterborough, that is, within twenty miles of Norfolk and Lincolnshire. The reader may doubt whether distinctions so sharp as this are warranted by what is known of English dialects six hundred and fifty years ago, especially when he finds (p. 59) that "Havlok the Dane," which uses *sh*, is referred to an Anglian locality, along with "Genesis and Exodus," which shows the Anglian *s*.

On page 81 we have a list of couplets, such as "*nature* and *kind*," "*mirth* and *jollity*," in which a French word is paired with a Saxon. But "*aid* and *abet*," "*chiere* and *face*," are inserted by mistake, as each consists of two French words; and these throw doubt on the explanation given for the rest by Mr. Earle and many others, that they were devised to meet the comprehension of all classes, when French was mingling with Saxon to form the new English.

It is difficult to understand why *to boot* should be taken (p. 84) from French *bouter* (to push), rather than from Anglo-Saxon *tó bôle* (for amends). For *bouter* makes in English *to butt*; and the explanation of *boot*, as meaning to "push a bargain," is hardly a natural one. On the other hand, both form and sense are perfectly explained by the Anglo-Saxon derivation: the A. S. *ō* usually makes Eng. *oo*; and that which is given to *boot* is given "for amends," to compensate for any disadvantage to the party that receives it.

We hardly know what to say of the remark (p. 112) that "*h* is almost classed with the *vowels*, as in the familiar rule which tells us to say *an* before a word beginning with a vowel or a silent *h*." That a mere silence should be classed, or *almost* classed, with the vowels (so named as being eminently *vocal*), seems strange enough; but still stranger that any one should fail to see that the two things classed together here are a vowel with *silent h* written before it and a vowel with *nothing* written before it. The rule, in fact, classes *h* with the *consonants*; for it implies that when it is an *h* (a sound, not a silence), it has the same effect as a consonant on the article preceding it. The fact that the old *h*, final or before consonants, where the English writes *gh* (as in *though*, *night*), ceased to be heard in pronunciation, is ascribed (p. 89) to French influence. But this sound maintained itself long after the Norman Conquest, down to the middle of the fourteenth (according to Mr. Ellis, till late in the sixteenth) century; while in the Old Norse, beyond the reach of any French influence, it was extinct in the thirteenth century, and probably for ages earlier: thus, O. N. *thó* (though), *nátt* (night). We may, therefore, reasonably doubt whether the French has had that influence on English pronunciation which our author supposes. Indeed, the English has shown in some respects a peculiar toughness in the preservation of ancient Teutonic sounds: in two very remarkable cases—the semivowel *w* and the spirant *th*—it has retained sounds which in all its sister-idioms have been corrupted or lost. In regard to the *w*, however, Mr. E. has a singular theory; he believes (p. 115) that the English sound of it came from the Welsh—came through the West Saxons on the Welsh border, and from them was communicated to the East Saxons and the Angles. "As an initial," he says, "it would hardly have existed had our language been educated in the Eastern counties" (which, by the way, seems inconsistent with the assertion, on p. 60, that "the Saxon literary language was not really native to Wessex, that it was not originally Saxon at all, but Anglian," i.e., belonging to Eastern counties). There is an emphasis here on the word *initial*; for he holds that a *w*-sound is naturally generated between almost any two vowels when pronounced in quick succession, an example of which he finds in A. S. *ofersawisc* (over-sea-ish, transmarine), not observing (what we see from Gothic *saiv-s*) that *saw* in this compound is the earlier form for A. S. *sw* (sea).

What utter misconception of the relations between Welsh and English is implied in this theory of a borrowed *w*, we have not the space to expose. Nor can we go into the reasons for believing that this sound was the common property of the old Teutonic idioms. We can only refer to the opinions of eminent investigators, who could feel no patriotic interest in the antiquity of the English sound; as the Dane Wimmer, in his "Altnordische Grammatik," who recognizes it in the Old Norse; and the German Heyne, in his "Grammatik der altgermanischen Dialekte," who recognizes it in the Gothic, in the Old High German, and (less confidently) in the Old Saxon of Northern Germany. Curiously enough, Mr. Earle, who regards it as the product of a Celtic influence, speaks of it (p. 145) as the "special birthright of English." A similar claim is put forward (p. 119) in the case of another semivowel: "We must consider this *y* consonant as being in some special sense the property of the English language." He acknowledges that the same sound, in words of the same origin, appears in the German and in other tongues. But the English has rescued it from a confusion with *o*, which prevailed in Anglo-Saxon writing, as *geong* (young); and has given it place in many words where it had no native right, as in *eve*,

in the name of the vowel *u*, in the boarding-school pronunciation of *kyind*, in the *yarm*, *yars* (for *arm*, *herbs*), of the Dorset dialect, etc. These are the supports of the English claim. It may be said, in passing, that Anglo-Saxon orthography, so much complained of as irregular and variable, has found a champion in Mr. E.: "For a manuscript literature, that of the last hundred years of the Saxon period is singularly orthographical." In illustration we may state that the Anglo-Saxon word for *young* appears in Grein's "Sprachschatz" with five different spellings, *geong*, *geng*, *ging*, *giung*, *iung*; though we cannot say that all of them belong to the century here named.

It is well known that *could* was in Anglo-Saxon *cûdhe*, in early English *couthé*, *cowde*; and it is generally supposed that when *l* had become silent in *should* and *would*, it was introduced by false analogy into *could*. To those who pronounced *woud*, *shoud*, *coud*, and wrote *would*, *should*, it might well seem natural to write *could* also. But our author supposes (p. 145) that while the *l* was pronounced in *would*, *should*, it was introduced as a silent letter into *could*; as if from the analogy of *went* and *sent* we should introduce a silent *n* into *get*, and write it *gent*. But he supposes further that the silence of this *l* in *would* had such force as to bring about at length the silence of *l* in *would* and *should*; much as if the analogy of *indict* should make us say *convite* (for *convict*), or the analogy of *salve* should make us say *raav* (for *ralve*). This preference of an arbitrary and improbable hypothesis for a simple and natural one gives striking proof of the author's inaptitude for philological reasoning.

Further evidence of the same fact may be found in the strange attempt (p. 420) to show that the English verbal in *-ing* is only a corrupted form of the Anglo-Saxon infinitive in *-an*, made by a direct euphonetic change of *-an* to *-ing*. For such a change the only examples he offers (aside from proper names) are the modern vulgarisms *captинг*, *gardинг*, and the like, for *captain*, *garden*. But the history of the A. S. infinitive is perfectly traceable; we know what became of it; we see A. S. *help-an* pass into Semi-Saxon *help-en* (so always in the "Ormulum"); and this into early English *help-en* or *help-e* (so in Chaucer); and this into *help-e* as sole form; and this finally into the modern *help*. So, too, the verbal in *-ing* can be traced with perfect certainty from Anglo-Saxon times to our own. It has never ceased to be used in the same form, though it has received an extension of its syntax. It can now have an object in the accusative, which it could not do in Anglo-Saxon. It has, in fact, taken on the construction of an infinitive, and may without impropriety be called by that name; but that it comes by actual descent from the old infinitive in *-an* there is no good reason for believing.

Speaking of the auxiliary *do*, our author calls it (pp. 490, 492) "a symbol-verb of a peculiarly insular character," an auxiliary "which peculiarly belongs to English." He seems not to be aware that expressions such as *er* that *kommen* (he did come) are frequent in colloquial German. Yet the first impulse to this use came, he thinks, from the French: "At its start it was a French-borrowed plume." It was from the construction of *faire* with the infinitive, to express a causal sense, that the English learned to use *do* in the same way: *he does him come* (causes him to come), like the French *il le fait venir*. In time, however, the English dropped the causal sense, so that *he does come* became nearly equivalent to *he comes*. It is in this way that he explains the genesis of the auxiliary *do*. But, in fact, the causal use of *do* with an infinitive is much older than he supposes. It is found in the Gothic (*ga-taujan*), in the old High German (*tuon*), and in the Anglo-Saxon, from which it passed into the Semi-Saxon and the early English. There is no reason whatever to regard it as the imitation of a French idiom. As for the non-causal use, which he considers not as French, but as an English alteration of the French idiom, this also is met with, though rarely, in the Anglo-Saxon; see Professor March's "Anglo-Saxon Grammar," § 406. This is one instance out of a considerable number which show an exaggerated estimate of the French influence on the formation and character of our language.

But we must not fail to notice a point of grammar which is dwelt on at great length, so as to be a leading feature of the work—the division of all words into *presentive* and *symbolic*. The division is not new, being substantially the same as the well-known division into *essential* and *formal* words, or into *conceptual* and *relational* words—into words which express objects, actions, qualities, and words which mark the relations of these to the speaker and to each other. The second class in all these cases consists mainly of pronouns, pronominal adverbs, prepositions, and conjunctions. What is new here is the novel and (as we must think) unhappily chosen term, *symbolic*, to denote this class. All words are *symbolic*; *tree*, *thought*, *dear*, *shine*, are as truly *symbols* of the conceptions they express as are *this* and *that* of the relations to the speaker which they denote. But our author's idea seems to be that a word is peculiarly *symbolic* when it can stand for many different things; so that *this* and *that*, being applicable to all things, must be in the highest degree *symbolic*. If so, *greater* and *smaller* ought to be *symbolic*

(not presentive), for any object may be called *greater* when compared with a smaller, or *smaller* when compared with a greater. Perhaps, indeed, Mr. E. would call these symbolic, though (on p. 207) he speaks of *more* as presentive, in "the *more* [i.e., greater] part"; for his hazy, unlogical conception of what he means by symbolic has involved him in numerous inconsistencies. In taking up the pronouns (p. 387) he says: "We now cross the greatest chasm in language—the chasm which separates the presentives from the symbolics." But this chasm appears somewhat differently when he tells us (p. 388) of expressions which "have passed, or at least are passing, into the region of the symbolic"; and (p. 329) of pronouns "which combine with their symbolism a certain qualified sort of presentive power," *subpresentive* he proposes to call it; and (p. 210) of words whose "signification lies on the confines of presentation and symbolism"; and especially (p. 417), "the presentive adverbs pass off by such fine and imperceptible shadings into a symbolic state, that the division must needs be exposed to uncertainty." That the position of this "greatest chasm" is really quite uncertain may be seen by looking at the two little paragraphs (pp. 210, 211) in which the symbolic words are distinguished by italics. Here, *happened* appears as presentive, but *went on* (continued to take place) as symbolic; *once* (one time) is marked as symbolic, but *ten* and *times* each as presentive; *home* figures as symbolic in *sent home*, but presentive in *at home*; *become* (in "individuals become types") stands as presentive, though *γίνεσθαι*, *fieri*, *devenir*, *werden*, are called (p. 489) "symbol-verbs of great mark each in its own language"; and it is said (p. 490) that "the word [become] has been thoroughly symbolized, and so qualified to take the place of our lost verb *wordhan*."

Mr. Earle insists strongly on the philological importance of this distinction between *presentive* and *symbolic*. The symbolic he declares (p. 211) to be the modern element—"the element which alone will give a basis for a philological distinction between ancient and modern languages." Yet on p. 214 he says: "The admiration which is accorded on all hands to the Greek language is due to the exquisite perfection of its symbolic element." The Greek, then, as it has the characteristically modern element, must be modern; even the early Greek of Homer, which abounds in particles, must be a modern language. Indeed our author (p. 218) does not shrink from this conclusion, but declares boldly that the Greek may be called truly modern. Now, we do not object to a classification in which some of the ancient languages should be associated with some or all of the modern; but it ought not to be made under wrong names. When a man professes to draw a line which shall separate ancient from modern languages, and draws it so that the language of Homer and the language of Walt Whitman are found on the same side, it may be a very good line, but it hardly corresponds to the professions of the drawer.

The reader now will not be surprised at the severity with which Mr. E. speaks (p. 215) of all attempts to penetrate the mysteries of Greek "symbolism," to find the sense of

"Those airy nothings which scholars have been chasing all these centuries ever since the revival of letters, every now and then fancying that they had seized them, till they were roused from their sweet delusion by the laughter of their fellow-idlers. The exact distinction between *μή* and *οὐ*, the precise meaning of *ἀν* and *δέ* and *δι* must forsooth be defined and settled; and it is very possible that we have not yet seen the last of these futile lucubrations."

We hope for better things. The scholars, blind as they are in their vain conceit of learning, cannot shut out this new light of symbolism. They must see that what is really wanted for the Greek particles is to recognize them as "symbolic" and—"modern."

Much as we have trespassed on the patience of the reader, we must add yet one brief passage (p. 426), not to be matched for the delightful unconsciousness, the more than Arcadian simplicity, which breathes in it. The small capitals are our own:

"Not very unlike this is the expression in the Offertory Rubric: 'While these sentences are in reading.' In modern English we should make it passive, and say: 'While these sentences ARE BEING READ.'"

*Theological and Philosophical Library*: A Series of Text-Books, Original and Translated, for Colleges and Theological Seminaries. Edited by Henry B. Smith, D.D., and Philip Schaff, D.D., Professors in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol I. of the Philosophical Division: A History of Philosophy, from Thales to the Present Time. By Friedrich Ueberweg, late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Königsberg. Translated from the fourth German edition, by George S. Morris, A.M., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Michigan. With additions by Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D., President of Yale College. With a preface by the Editors of the Philosophical and Theological Library. Vol. I.:

History of the Ancient and Mediæval Philosophy. (New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1872.)—Hitherto, no general history of philosophy has existed in the English language which deserves to be called thoroughly good. Schwegler's little handbook, which has twice been translated, is unintelligible to beginners and of little use to advanced students. Lewes's history is only an account of the relation of different systems to the Positivist conceptions, interspersed with biographical notices of their authors. Tennemann's manual is out of date as a book of reference, and gives a learner no clear notion of the doctrines taught in the different schools.

Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that even people who have paid some attention to philosophy have been ill acquainted with its history, that false conceptions have prevailed of the general causes of the advances of philosophical thought, and that the importance of understanding this branch of human history has been almost overlooked. There are several familiar books written to show the manner in which civilization in general has progressed, while Whewell's writings have beautifully illustrated the development of the natural sciences. But the very popularity of a *biographical* history of philosophy shows, to our mind, that but crude notions of the movement of speculative intelligence have been current. An event in the life of a writer may doubtless color his own mind, and so by his influence slightly deflect the current of the thought of his age and of succeeding ages. But the effect is almost infinitesimal. A great leader in philosophy must no doubt be a man of power; but he must also teach things that men are disposed to listen to. No man can turn back the general current of thought by any mental superiority or agreeable style of writing. On the other hand, if there be a doctrine to which a large part of the world is inclined, it will surely get developed, if not by this man, then by another. Descartes's life, for example, may easily have helped to make him set forth the metaphysics he did; but whether the world would accept this or that doctrine which he advanced depended principally on what that doctrine was, and comparatively little on the fact that it was Descartes who had originated it. If he had not lived at all, there is evidence to show that substantially the same doctrines would have been published. Thus biography does not much illustrate the course of philosophical speculation, but on the contrary the contemplation of the subject from that point of view draws the attention away from the main historic causes.

Moved by these reasons, perhaps, Drs. Smith and Schaff have made the first two volumes of their new Theological and Philosophical Library a translation of Ueberweg's "History of Philosophy." Nothing could have been more judicious. There was nothing so much needed in the philosophical department of their undertaking at least, and we are distinctly of opinion that no other book which exists in any language or which could have been written would supply that want half so well as the particular treatise they have selected. It is a calm and moderate production, not written in the interest of any system of philosophy or theory of history. It is carefully accurate and executed with great evenness throughout. It sketches the doctrines of the different schools and masters with admirable power of delineation and perspicuity, and under each head it refers the reader for further information to a large and select list of books and memoirs. In short, it will do immense good simply as a model of scholarship for all who write upon philosophy; and it will make all young students see what an indispensable aid to the formation of philosophical conceptions which may be really up to our age is a study of the origins and growth of existing conceptions.

Professor Moore's version is distinguished from most translations from philosophical German in being not an unintelligible jumble of strange words, but correct, perspicuous, smooth, and pleasant to read. Ueberweg, it is true, is a very plain and simple writer compared with the German philosophers of the past, but that has not prevented the recent English translation of his logic from being decidedly obscure.

*The History of Ancient Art*, translated from the German of John Winckelmann, by G. Henry Lodge, M.D. Vol. III. (Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. 1872.)—The name of Johann Joachim Winckelmann is well known among the names of writers upon art and archaeology, while yet his influence over more recent writers upon these subjects has not been very great. The "Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums" was first published in Dresden in 1764, and this first edition is not rare; nor is that of 1776; nor are the three or four editions of the French translation; nor is the Italian version; one or the other of these is in every library of books on art. Messrs. Osgood & Co. are about to try whether an English translation of the whole work, published in four dignified volumes, will be successful. There has been no complete English version. We believe Dr. Lodge published, in 1849, in Boston, a translation of a part, under the title, "Ancient Art among the Greeks," and of this we have seen an English reprint. Afterwards, it seems, an earlier portion of the work was translated, and issued, says a circular from Messrs.

Osgood & Co., in 1856. And these two issues will form Vol. II. and Vol. I. respectively of the newly completed English translation of the work. The publishers send us Vol. III., and announce that new editions of Vols. I. and II. will be brought out, and that Vol. IV. will appear during the current year. The volume before us, the third, contains Books VI., VII., and VIII., which treat, respectively, of drapery, with dress, armor, and jewelry generally, as used by the Greeks and Romans; the materials used in art, together with some speculation about the processes of painting employed by the ancients; and the rise and decline of artistic style and taste under the Greek and the Roman dominion.

An archaeological work published in 1764 has to be entirely rewritten for modern use, and this from the fact that what we now mean by archaeology is of later date than 1764. Winckelmann deserves credit, indeed, as one of the first to perceive the possibility of such a science; but the science itself has far outgrown him, and the opinions and statements contained in his book have to be re-examined in the light of modern criticism. That this has been done to a certain extent at least is proved by the prodigious accumulation of notes by many different editors. One-fourth of the volume before us consists of these notes—or rather much more than a fourth, as the type is smaller than that of the text. And, as might be expected, the notes often contradict flatly the text to which they refer, and often qualify it; they are fully as important as the text, and more trustworthy, and it is a serious fault in the volume before us that it is so difficult to use them. There is no sign on the page you are reading what chapter you are in, so that if the reader finds (10) and looks for the corresponding note, he must first turn back and hunt through the pages for the heading of the chapter; then he must find what "Book" he is in, which is most quickly done by the table of contents; then, upon turning forward to the notes, there is still no helping margin or running title; the first (10) he comes to is the wrong one (the table of contents will not help in this case), and he has to search for book and chapter and to count backward and forward unceasingly. The delay and annoyance caused by this little fault, so easy to correct and so inexcusable, as it seems to us, are a very serious hindrance to using the book at all. There is a note to nearly every page of text, and, as we have said, the reader dares not overlook one of them, for fear it might contain a flat contradiction of what the text has asserted.

*The Coin Book*, comprising a History of Coinage; A Synopsis of the Mint Laws of the United States, etc., etc. With engravings of the principal coins. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1872.)—We can recommend the "Coin Book," to those among our readers interested in the study of numismatics, as a useful and carefully edited compilation. The first part of the volume gives an account of the history of the coinage of Great Britain, by Mr. Robert Musket, of the Royal Mint of London, taken from the "Encyclopædia Britannica." This article is carefully written, and Mr. Musket has evidently read with care authors such as Messrs. Ruding, Hawkins, and Snelling, whose works on the coinage of Great Britain are looked upon as standard authorities. It is, however, rather difficult to agree with Mr. Musket in the very bold statement that the social and political status of a nation can be judged by the beauty or art of the existing coinage. The coinage all over Europe at the present time, though accurate in weight and fineness, cannot be held up to view as proof of "artistic design and beauty." Should a comparison be drawn between the crown piece of Great Britain, the five-franc piece of France, or the German thaler, with either a tetradrachm of Mithradates VI., King of Pontus, or one of those lovely medallions given as prizes at the Syracusan games, the award of impartial criticism would be more flattering to the ancient artist than to modern mint-masters. Nor can we agree with Mr. Musket in the statement that the coinage appears to be gradually approaching the highest degree of excellence, as in our opinion the five-pound piece struck for George III. by Pistrucci is a finer work of art than the coin of the same value executed by the elder Wyon.

Our forefathers, the early Britons, took as a model for their coinage the stater of Philip of Macedon; and a view of the numerous changes which this beautiful coin underwent forms a curious chapter in the great book of history. The quadriga, at first attempted, disappears entirely; a vague outline, drawn with the same artistic finish that would be found on the slate of some infant school-boy, represents a horse, while the wheels of the chariot can be no longer accounted for. The Saxon and Norman coinages, though more pretentious, do not exhibit any high advancement in art, the portraiture being utterly unrecognizable. The difficulty of minting must have been hard to overcome, as will be seen by the following passage extracted from the "Coin Book": "The metal brought to the mints for coinage was, after being tried, reduced to sterling or standard by alloy when too fine, and refined if too low in quality; but by

what means the latter operation was performed we remain in ignorance. The metal so melted was cast into small bars, and these were flattened by a hammer; and out of these fillets or plates square pieces were cut of nearly equal weight, and then rounded at the forge. These were stamped simply by fixing a die in a block of wood, while another was used as a punch, and repeatedly struck with a hammer till it received the required impression." From this description it will be seen that our ancestors were not to be congratulated on their mechanical contrivances, though we must own that very few among the many coins which have come down to our time bear evidences of double striking. The Romans, even at so early an age as that preceding the reign of Augustus, were more fortunate in their apparatus. The British Museum lately acquired, through M. Feuardent, an original die and punch, found in the south of France, in such perfect preservation as to enable the officers to identify at once the coin with those of the same family in the cabinets of the Coin Room. The first gold coins in the English series (which Mr. Musket does not describe, and which are very little known even in England) were issued in the forty-first year of the reign of Henry III., A.D. 1257. The record is to be found in an old manuscript chronicle of the city of London, and reads thus: "Hoc anno creavit rex moneta aurea denar-pond-duos sterlings de auro purissimo et voluit ut illo auro curret in pond-viginti." Snelling adds: "Here seems by some means to be a mistake of the word *pond* for *denar* in the value." These coins were not, however, popular. Carte informs us that they were recalled by royal mandate, November 4 of the same year. The two best specimens of these valuable relics exist in the English series of coins in the British Museum, the large sum of £41 10s. being paid for one of them to the executors of the late Mr. Tyssen. From the above date to the year 1343, no gold coins were struck. Edward III., however, caused gold to be issued as coinage, and from that reign to the present time the series presents a rich and varied aspect.

The "Coin Book" also informs us that the coining-press or mill was of French origin, the invention being generally ascribed to Antoine Brucher, who, in 1553, first tried it in the palace of Henry II. of France for the stamping of counters. It continued in use till 1585, but being considered too expensive, the old system of hammering returned into fashion. Briot, another French artist, in the year 1623, unable to induce his own country to return to the coining-press, emigrated to England, and his series of shillings and sixpences can be pointed to as some of the finest work ever sent out from the English mint. They can be recognized by the B under the truncation of the bust of Charles I. The coining-press was, however, abandoned during the revolutionary troubles; but Blondeau, also a Frenchman, induced Charles II. to allow him to set up a press with some of his own inventions. The press is now used, greatly improved, though this cannot be said of the art.

Further on we have a chapter headed "Synopsis of the Acts of Congress regulating the Mint." Here will be found much valuable information relating to the officers of the mint; assay and coinage of bullion; annual trial of coinage; and other laws and regulations referring to our own mint, carefully tabulated so as to be easy and useful for reference. A "Numismatic Dictionary," containing "names of all coins known from the earliest period up to the present day," is tolerably accurate. For merchants and business men is affixed a useful table—"The Daily Price of Gold from 1862 to 1870." The engravings of the leading gold and silver coins of the United States, France, Great Britain, Mexico, Prussia, Russia, and Spain, engraved for the "Merchants' and Bankers' Almanac for 1871," are the worst feature of the book, being badly and incorrectly drawn, and in no way adding to the value of the work.

*Poor Miss Finch. A Novel.* By Wilkie Collins. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1872.)—Poor Miss Finch, the heroine of this story, is blind. Oscar, the hero, is an amiable young man, who has already been tried for murder but acquitted, and is particularly remarkable for a dark-blue complexion, the result of his taking nitrate of silver to cure his epileptic fits, which fits are the consequences of an attempted assassination. These two young persons become engaged, and everything promises a happy match until the arrival of Oscar's twin-brother, who resembles him in every particular—height, voice, shape, bearing—except that, having eschewed nitrate of silver, his face is as ruddy as that of most Englishmen. He, too, falls in love with Miss Finch, and introduces a surgeon who succeeds in restoring the blind girl's sight. Oscar, however, had concealed his misfortune from Miss Finch, who, in spite of her blindness, has rather morbid opinions on the subject of color, and, having wound himself up in various falsehoods, dreads the mortification of a disclosure, and when she mistakes Nugent—the brother—for him, a mistake which rejoices the heart of the enamored twin, flees from the country, leaving the clear-complexioned villain to play the part of the girl's betrothed. This is the ground-work of the novel. A curious and intricate mesh of intrigue follows; but the result is that the girl cries herself

blind again. Oscar returns, detects his brother's dishonorable conduct, is found by her to be the one whom she had really loved, and, of course, they are married. That the story is interesting in a certain way cannot be denied. There is a judicious combination of tragedy of a certain sort and comedy of a certain sort. And then, too, the way that the villain has of entering the room just as the innocent hero has left; the way in which scraps of paper thrown aside as carelessly as we throw away old envelopes, turn up again a hundred pages later, and nearly break off a marriage and drive two lovers to despair; the mysterious influence that the most ordinary and everyday acts exercise upon the plot of the story, all combine in giving us the impression of a sort of civilized romanticism, of a fairyland under the control of the police of the present day, that at certain moments makes such stories far from unreadable. But again, when we look at the story more coolly, we find around so petty a building such a lofty scaffolding, so many derricks, cranes, and pulleys, and, when the tale is finished, so little done in comparison with the immense preparations that have been made, that one is rather curious about the quality of mind that can produce such wonderfully intricate skeletons of stories without the power of more completely hiding the dry bones with the better-known and more attractive covering that we see in the life about us. For what is the aim of this story? That the blind should marry the dark-blue? There is then an excellent opening for some novelist, distracted for a plot, to write about the love of the color-blind for the jaundiced. Is it that twin-brothers should not pretend to be one another—that two minutes after we have left a room we should put our heads in the door to see if our deadliest foe is maligning us in our absence? But how petty, how exceedingly unreal seem just those stories that are so evidently most anxious to preserve the air of realism. Whatever may be said against the vanity of existence, it is not all a combination of missing trains, listening behind doors, and mysterious meetings. That is all that Mr. Collins sees in it, and therein lies his weakness. On the whole, the story may perhaps be recommended to persons about to take a long railway journey, or who, when at sea, are just well enough to sit up and read without growing dizzy.

*The Princess and the Goblin.* By George Macdonald. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1872.)—In this child's story, Mr. Macdonald has simply followed his ingenious fancy, he has forborne all introduction of misplaced preaching, and the result is a charming little tale, pretty but not "goody-goody," and fantastical enough to please any but the most boisterous boys, although we imagine it will rather be the favorite of little girls, therein resembling the fate of his more ambitious works with grown people. It is the story of a little girl, a princess, who lives in a castle on a mountain, and is exposed to great dangers from the kobolds who dwell in the subter-

ranean depths. The story itself we will not abridge; it is very slight, and almost the whole of the charm lies in the telling of it. The invention it shows is so innocent and poetical, the fancy is so ingenious without being artificial, that we would set it above even some of the most highly praised children's books of the day. In comparison with it, in regard to facility of fancy, even "*Alice's Adventures*" are cold and mechanical, though we dislike to say a word against a book which has that little girl in it. One would never laugh over "*The Princess and the Goblin*," but we think it might well become the favorite book of a rather serious child. Even if children should not care for it, their parents might find less entertaining books for an evening's reading. To our mind, it is in this story that Mr. Macdonald is at his best.

\* \* \* Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

#### BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.

Publishers.—Prices.

Browne (J. H. B.), <i>The Medical Jurisprudence of Insanity</i> . . . . .	(S. Whitney & Co.)
De Forest (J. W.) <i>Kate Beaumont; a Tale</i> . . . . .	(J. R. Osgood & Co.) \$1 25
De Vere (Prof. M. S.), <i>Americanisms</i> , 2d ed. . . . .	(C. Scribner & Co.)
Gray (Rev. J. C.), <i>Bible Lore</i> . . . . .	(Dodd & Mead)
Greene (Prof. G. W.), <i>Historical View of the American Revolution</i> , 3d ed. . . . .	(Hurd & Houghton)
King (C.), <i>Mountaineering in the Sierra Nevada</i> . . . . .	(J. R. Osgood & Co.) 2 50
Leland (C. G.), Scheffel's <i>Gaudermanns</i> . . . . .	" " " 1 50
Newberry (Prof. J. S.), <i>Geological Survey of Ohio</i> . . . . .	(Nevin & Myers)
Monroe (L. B.), <i>Public and Parlor Readings</i> . . . . .	(Lee & Shepard)
McLain (Mary W.), <i>Keeping Open House</i> . . . . .	(M. H. Mallory & Co.)
Quarterly German Magazine, Nov 1871, swd. . . . .	(E. Steiger)
Reynolds (G. W. M.), <i>Veneta Trelawney</i> , swd. . . . .	(T. B. Peterson & Bros.)
Stretton (Hooba), <i>Bede's Charity</i> . . . . .	(Dodd & Mead)
Supplement to Bicknell's <i>Village Builder</i> . . . . .	(A. J. Bicknell & Co.) 5 00
Sypher (J. R.), <i>The Art of Teaching School</i> . . . . .	(J. M. Stoddart & Co.)
Streeter (Dr. H. R.), <i>Voice Building</i> . . . . .	(White & Goulland)
Segneri (P.), <i>Lenten Sermons</i> , Vol. I . . . . .	(Catholic Pub. Soc.) 1 50
Somerset (Duke of), <i>Christian Theology and Modern Scepticism</i> . (Appleton & Co.)	
The Best Reading: Hints on the Selection of Books, swd. . . . .	(G. P. Putnam & Sons) 0 90
Tyerman (Rev. L.), <i>Life and Times of Rev. John Wesley</i> , Vol. I (Harper & Bros.)	
Von Spruner (Dr. K.), <i>Hand-Atlas for the Middle Ages and for Modern Times</i> . Parts II., III., IV., swd. . . . .	(B. Westermann & Co.)
Whittlesey (Elsie L.), <i>Helen Ethinger; a Tale</i> . . . . .	(Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger)
Wharton (F.), <i>Treatise on the Conflict of Laws</i> . . . . .	(Kay & Bro.)
Wunderlich (Prof. C. A.) and Seguin (Dr. E.), <i>Medical Thermometry and Human Temperature</i> . . . . .	(Wm. Wood & Co.)
Yale Naught-ical Almanac for 1872, swd. . . . .	(C. C. Chatfield & Co.)

#### LEGENDS OF THE PATRIARCHS AND PROPHETS

Current at the East, collected by Baring Gould.  
Crown 8vo, \$2.

"We venture to predict that few books will be more delightful to a great part of our readers." He has collected from the Talmud and other Rabbinical books, apocryphal Scripture, and still other ancient sources, a vast store of the most curious—to put it plainly—"yarns" about the fall of the angels, the creation of the pre-Adamites, Adam and Eve, the Fall, the Giants, the Deluge, the realms of the ark, and the Old Testament personages, especially Abraham, Joseph, Moses, and Solomon."—New York Evening Mail.

"It will be his (the reader's) own loss if he foregoes the pleasure and the profit of reading this entertaining volume."—Saturday Review.

HOLT & WILLIAMS, 25 Bond Street, N. Y.

#### PRESIDENT PORTER'S NEW WORK.

#### THE SCIENCES OF NATURE vs. THE SCIENCE OF MAN.

BY NOAH PORTER, D.D., LL.D.,  
President of Yale College.

One volume 16mo, \$1.

"President Porter attacks modern infidel science at the point of its mortal weakness."—Christian Intelligencer.

DODD & MEAD,

762 Broadway, N. Y.

IN imperial 8vo, double columns, price \$8, handsomely printed in a new, clear, old-faced type.

#### A DICTIONARY OF ENGLISH ETYMOLOGY.

BY HENSLÉIGH WEDGWOOD.

Second Edition, thoroughly revised and corrected by the Author, and extended to the Classical Roots of the Language (with the assistance of the Rev. J.

C. ATKINSON, Author of the Glossary of the Cleveland Dialect).

With an Introduction on the Formation of Language.

In preparing this Edition the Author has had the benefit of the learned and very judicious annotations of Mr. George P. Marsh in the American Edition of the First Volume of the Dictionary, which have in many cases led to the adoption of his views. Attention has also been given to the criticisms in the Etymological Dictionary of G. Müller (Köthen 1865-7), and to the scattered suggestions on the derivations of words which occur in various periodicals. Wherever the etymology of the First Edition has been materially altered, the word is marked with an asterisk. In deference to the judgment of respected friends, the etymology of words of classic derivation, which in general were omitted in the First Edition, has been concisely inserted in the present work.

Copies will be sent to any address, on receipt of the price (\$8). by

MACMILLAN & CO., Publishers,

28 Bleecker Street, New York.

ONE REASON MORE why Hurd & Houghton's (Riverside Press) unabridged, enlarged, and corrected edition of SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, edited by Hackett and Abbot, 4 vols. 8vo, 3667 pp., 576 illustrations, cloth, \$26, is better than the English edition of the same, and thus the best Bible Dictionary in the English language, is that the labors of American scholars have been recognized, not only by the use of articles from them, but by a very full reference in the Bibliographical portions to books and articles accessible to American students. In fact, no pains have been spared to make the American the best.

TWO German Ladies, residing in the City of Hanover, Germany, are prepared to receive a few young ladies as private boarders who wish a pleasant home while finishing their education in the excellent schools of that city. For particulars, apply to "I. D.," P. O. Box 2136, Philadelphia.

FAMILIES OR YOUNG PERSONS Wishing to Study Abroad, and obtain the Purest German or Hanoverian Accent, can find the comforts of a home in an officer's family in Hanover. Distinguished resident PROFESSORS of Languages and Music. Terms, \$35 per Month, Gold. References given and required. Address, MRS. C. GIESECKE, Königstrasse, 13, Hanover, Prussia.

SALESMAN or BOOK-KEEPER.—A young and trustworthy man, who has had experience, desires employment in either of the above positions. Can furnish good references.

Address, G., P. O. Box 6732, New York City.

OFFICE OF THE  
A T L A N T I C  
MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.

NEW YORK, January 26, 1872.

*The Trustees, in conformity to the Charter of the Company, submit the following Statement of its affairs on the 31st December, 1871:*

Premiums received on Marine Risks from 1st January, 1871, to 31st December, 1871, . . . . . \$5,412,777 51  
Premiums on Policies not marked off 1st January, 1871, . . . . . 2,033,675 18  
Total amount of Marine Premiums, . . . . . \$7,446,452 69

No Policies have been issued upon Life Risks, nor upon Fire Risks disconnected with Marine Risks.  
Premiums marked off from 1st January, 1871, to 31st December, 1871, . . . . . \$5,375,793 24

Losses paid during the same period, . . . . . \$2,735,980 63

Returns of Premiums and expenses, . . . . . \$973,211 84  
The Company has the following Assets, viz.,  
United States and State of New York Stock,  
City, Bank, and other Stocks, . . . . . \$143,240 00  
Loans, secured by Stocks and otherwise, . . . . . 3,379,060 00  
Real Estate and Bonds and Mortgages, . . . . . 217,500 00  
Interest, and sundry Notes and Claims due the Company, estimated at . . . . . 386,739 41  
Premium Notes and Bills receivable, . . . . . 2,405,937 95  
Cash in Bank, . . . . . 274,345 01

Total Amount of Assets, . . . . . \$14,806,812 37

Six per cent. interest on the outstanding certificates of profits will be paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday the Sixth of February next.

The outstanding certificates of the issue of 1868 will be redeemed and paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the Sixth of February next, from which date all interest thereon will cease. The certificates to be produced at the time of payment, and cancelled.

Upon certificates which were issued (in red scrip) for gold premiums, such payment of interest and redemption will be in gold.

A dividend of Forty per cent. is declared on the net earned premiums of the Company, for the year ending 31st December, 1871, for which certificates will be issued on and after Tuesday, the Second of April next.

By order of the Board,

J. H. CHAPMAN, Secretary.

TRUSTEES:

J. D. Jones, C. A. Hand,  
Charles Dennis, James Low,  
W. H. H. Moore, B. J. Howland,  
Henry Colt, Benj. Babcock,  
Wm. C. Pickersgill, Robt. B. Minturn,  
Lewis Curtis, Gordon W. Burnham,  
Charles H. Russell, Frederick Channing,  
Lowell Holbrook, Geo. S. Stephenson,  
Royal Phelps, William H. Webb,  
Caleb Barstow, Sheppard Gandy,  
A. P. Pillot, Francis Skiddy,  
William E. Dodge, Charles P. Burdett,  
David Lane, Robt. C. Ferguson,  
James Bryce, William E. Bunker,  
Daniel S. Miller, Samuel L. Mitchell,  
Wm. Sturgis, James G. De Forest,  
Henry K. Bogert, Robert L. Stuart,  
Dennis Perkins, Alexander V. Blake,  
Joseph Gaillard, Jr., Charles D. Leverich.

JOHN D. JONES, President.  
CHARLES DENNIS, Vice-President.  
W. H. H. MOORE, 2d Vice-President.  
J. D. HEWLETT, 3d Vice-President.

E N G L I S H W R O U G H T - I R O N F E N C E.

We are prepared to receive orders for Wrought-Iron Fence of the best English make, especially suited to Country Seats, for the enclosing of lawns, for dividing lines of properties, and for use in Parks and all Ornamental Grounds. Delivery could be made at New York, Philadelphia, Boston, or Baltimore. This fence, while ornamental, is much the most economical that can be used, being practically indestructible. It is an absolute protection against cattle. It can be set up without difficulty, and once in place, is perfectly firm and secure.

Specimen panels of different styles may be seen at our office, or drawings of them can be forwarded to any address.

Entrance and Hand-gates and pillars for the same we are prepared also to order.

TARNALL & TRIMBLE,  
147 South Front Street, Philadelphia.

T. B. BROOKS, [C. E.,  
IRON EXPERT,

In charge of Michigan Geological Survey of the Marquette Iron Region, gives exclusive attention to Explorations and Surveys of Iron Ore Lands and Mines. Address, until May 1: Care School of Mines, Cor. Forty-ninth Street and Fourth Avenue, New York.

M A C M I L L A N & C O .' S  
PUBLICATIONS.

BARING-GOULD'S NEW BOOK.

LEGENDS OF OLD TESTAMENT CHAR-

RACTERS, from the Talmud and other Sources. By the Rev. S. Baring-Gould, M.A., author of "Curious Myths of the Middle Ages." Crown 8vo, \$2.

"We venture to predict that few books will be more delightful to the majority of our readers than Rev. S. Baring-Gould's 'Legends of Old Testament Characters.' The author has collected from the Talmud, other Rabbinical books, apocryphal Scripture, and still other ancient sources, a vast store of the most curious—to put it plainly—yarns about the fall of the angels, the creation, the pre-Adamites, Adam and Eve, the Fall, the giants, the Deluge, the remains of the Ark, and the Old Testament personages, especially Abraham, Joseph, Moses, and Solomon."—N. Y. Evening Mail.

"The book is one to be taken up at any odd moment, and to be laid down with difficulty, or to be carefully studied on account of its wealth of out-of-the-way and most attractive information."—Philadelphia Press.

"It is important to the student and interesting to the general reader."—Philadelphia Age.

SPECIMENS OF ENGLISH LITERA-TURE. From "The Ploughman's Crede" to the "Shephearde's Calendar," A.D. 1394—A.D. 1579. With Introduction, Notes, and Glossarial Index. By the Rev. Walter W. Skeat, M.A., late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge. 1 thick 12mo vol., \$3.

"The object of this volume is to supply the student and general reader with trustworthy and useful extracts from writings of the fifteenth and part of the sixteenth centuries."—Editor's Introduction.

THE PHILOLOGY OF THE ENGLISH TONGUE. By John Earle, M.A., sometime Professor of Anglo-Saxon at Oxford. 12mo, \$2.

"This is a treatise recondite yet popular, showing how the English language has been formed, what it is and why. It is a pleasure to read such a book, full of illustrative quotations—from American as well as other authors—and pleasantly putting everything in the clearest light."—Philadelphia Pres.

THE HISTORY OF THE NORMAN CONQUEST OF ENGLAND: its Causes and Results. By Edward A. Freeman, M.A., D.C.L., Oxon. With Maps and Plans.

Vols. I., II., and III., price \$18; Vol. IV. (just published), \$8.

"A perfect miracle of research. The book is a noble book, and the greatest incident of our history is in the hands of an historian who can tell it as it ought to be told."—Saturday Review.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

HISTORICAL ESSAYS. By Edward A. Freeman, M.A., D.C.L., Oxon. 8vo, \$4.

"The subjects are treated with decided ability and sound learning, and with great independence of judgment. . . . The work affords an agreeable series of recreations to the historical student."—N. Y. Tribune.

"The essays in the present volume are singularly full of information. The book abounds in true historical reflections of the greatest value and solidity."—London Pall Mall Gazette.

THE HISTORY OF NAPOLEON I. By P. Lanfrey. Vol. I. 8vo, \$3 50.

"It is unquestionably and immeasurably the best biography of Napoleon that has yet been produced."—Saturday Review.

LIVY. Book I. Edited, with Historical Introduction and Notes, by J. R. Seeley, M.A., Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 8vo, \$2 50.

SOPHOCLES: the Plays and Fragments.

Edited, with English Notes and Introduction, by Lewis Campbell, LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrews. 2 vols. Vol. I., containing "Edipus Coloneus," "Edipus Tyrannus," and "Antigone." 8vo, \$6.

OUTLINES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

applied to the New Testament. By C. E. Hammond, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. Extra fep. 8vo, \$1 50.

LIFE OF BISHOP BEDELL. By his Son.

Now first Edited by John E. B. Mayor, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Forming the Third Part in Mr. Mayor's "Cambridge in the 17th Century." Fep. 8vo, \$1 75.

NOTE-BOOK ON PRACTICAL SOLID OR DESCRIPTIVE GEOMETRY, containing Problems, with Help for Solutions. By J. H. Edgar, M.A., and G. S. Prichard. 12mo, cloth, \$1 25.

MACMILLAN & CO.,  
38 Bleecker Street, New York.

JUST PUBLISHED.

8vo, cloth extra, pp. 595, price \$4.

A CHURCH HISTORY OF THE FIRST SEVEN CENTURIES,

To the close of the Sixth General Council. By the late Rev. Milo Mahan, D.D.

Tracts for the Church and the Age. No. I.

ABOUT THE BISHOPS'

DECLARATION ON BAPTISM;

With something about Prayer-Book revision and Church Progress. A Letter to a Layman.

By C. S. HENRY, D.D.,

12mo, paper, 15 cts.

Post Free on receipt of price.

POTT, YOUNG & CO.,

Cooper Union, New York.

NOW READY:

ON THE NATURE OF THINGS

(De Rerum Natura).

From the Latin of Lucretius.

BY CHARLES FREDERICK JOHNSON.

With Introduction and Notes.

1 vol. crown 8vo, handsomely printed. Price, in cloth, \$2 50; half-calf, extra, \$4.

For sale by all booksellers, or sent free, on receipt of the price by the publishers,

DE WITT C. LENT & CO.,

451 Broome Street, New York.

A. DENHAM & CO.

Have in Press, and will publish March 15,

THE MINOR POEMS OF HOMER:

THE BATTLE OF THE FROGS AND MICE.

HYMNS AND EPIGRAMS,

Translated by Parcell, Chapman, Shelley, Congreve, and Hole. With Introductions by Henry Nelson Coleridge, and a Translation of the Life of Homer, attributed to Herodotus.

In one vol. 12mo, cloth, 200 pp., handsomely printed on tinted paper, price \$1 50.

A. DENHAM & CO.,

Publishers and Importers,

Near Broadway. 17 MURRAY ST., NEW YORK.

Priced Catalogues of our English and Foreign Books sent free of charge to any address.

RUSKIN'S NEW VOLUMES.

JOHN WILEY & CO.,

No. 15 ASTOR PLACE,

Have nearly ready:

SESAME AND LILIES. With Additions. New edition. Being Vol. I. of Ruskin's Works. 8vo, cloth, \$1 50.

MUNERA PULVERIS. Letters on Political Economy. Being Vol. II. of Ruskin's Works. 8vo, cloth, \$1 50.

Do., 12mo, cloth, \$1.

FORS CLAVIGERA. Letters to Workmen. Part II. 12mo, cloth, \$1.

SUPPLEMENT TO DANA'S MINERALOGY. Bringing the work down to the present time. By Profs. J. D. Dana and Geo. J. Brush. 8vo, 75 cents.

THE BREATH OF LIFE. By Geo. Catlin. New edition. Limp cloth, 75 cents.

